THE CALIPHATE THE HEJAZ AND THE SAUDI-WAHHABI NATION-STATE

Imran N. Hosein

MASJID DARUL QUR'AN, LONG ISLAND, NEW YORK

First published in 1996 by
Masjid Darul Qur'an,
1514 East Third Avenue,
Bayshore, NY 11760
USA

Email: inhosein@hotmail.com

Web: http://imranhosein.org

Dedicated to my dear brother

Abid Siddiqui

of the Muslim Center of New York

CONTENTS

PREFACE

This is a third publication in the Ansari Memorial Series, published in honor of my teacher and *Shaikh* of blessed memory, *Maulana* Dr. Muhammad Fadlur Rahman Ansari (1914 - 1974). The previous two publications were entitled: *'The Religion of Abraham and the State of Israel – A View from the Qur'an'*, and *'The Importance of the Prohibition of Riba in Islam'.*

Much of the research work for this book was done during the years 1975-1979 at the United Nations Library in the *Palais des Nations*, Geneva, while I was a doctoral student in International Relations at the Graduate Institute of International Studies, Geneva.

We are experiencing, at the time of writing a rapidly deteriorating situation in today's Muslim World with bloody conflicts inflicting unimaginable suffering on innocent Muslims in Bosnia, Kashmir, Algeria, Palestine, Chechnya etc. Yesterday it was fifty thousand Muslim women raped in Bosnia, and today's horror stories are about a son who was forced to bite off his Muslim father's testicles in Bosnia, and the innocent blind Muslim *Shaikh*, Omar Abdul Rahman, who was condemned to life imprisonment in USA (because he posed too great a threat to the pro-west secular regime which rules Egypt), and who is sexually humiliated by prison guards whenever he has a visitor at prison.

I am now convinced that the time has at last come for this work to reach the Muslim public who may now be sufficiently shaken up to look seriously for the causes of our impotence. They may, as a consequence, take this work seriously and brush off the expected protests from establishment scholars, and the governments that they support, around the Muslim world!

I pray that Allah may accept and bless this humble effort in the cause of Truth. May it so impact upon Muslims that their eyes will be opened to the fact that the Saudi-Wahhabi regime that now controls the *Haramain* and the *Hejaz* played an active role in the destruction of the Islamic Caliphate and have since then constituted an obstruction to the restoration of power for the *Ummah. Ameen!*

I. N. H.
Masjid Dar al-Qur'an,
November 1996. Jumadi al-Thani 1417

THE CALIPHATE THE HEJAZ AND THE SAUDI-WAHHABI NATION-STATE

INTRODUCTION

One of the essential characteristics of the religion of Islam is its insistence that when a people recognize Allah Most High as 'sovereign' (*al-Malik*) then they must ensure that the State and all its institutions submit to Allah's supreme authority and supreme law. If the State, rather than Allah, is recognized as sovereign, and that is the essence of the secularism, Islam declares such to be *Shirk* (blasphemy) and that is the greatest sin possible.

Around the world today the modern secular State is universally recognized as sovereign. Its authority is recognized as supreme, and so too its law. And so, around the world today mankind is now embraced by a universal political *Shirk (*blasphemy*)*. This is, in fact, one of the major signs that we now live in the age of *Dajjal*, the false Messiah or Anti-Christ, who deceived mankind into worshipping other than Allah Most High. He, *Dajjal*, is the mastermind behind today's world order about which the *Hadith* declares that 999 out of every 1000 will enter into the hellfire. But even Muslims seem to be unaware of this.

Since Muslims recognized Allah as sovereign, they never recognized Constitution, Parliament, Supreme Court, Government etc., as sovereign. The sovereignty of Allah implies the supremacy of the religion of Islam

and, in particular, the sacred law or *Shariah*. The institution of the Caliphate symbolized that supremacy of Islam over the State and over public life. The Caliph, who was otherwise known as the *Ameer* or *Imam*, was the head of the *Jama'ah* or community of Muslims. They pledged allegiance to him through the institution of *baiy'ah*. The territory in which that *Jama'ah* was located was designated *Dar al-Islam.* It was so designated because the *Ameer* had the freedom and authority to enforce Allah's sacred law in that territory.

Euro-Christian civilization was also founded on recognition of divine sovereignty. In that civilization, however, it was the Church that was recognized as God's representative on the earth, and the State was thus subservient to the Church.

But Europe experienced a conflict between religion and the State that resulted in the defeat of the Church. The consequence was that Europe experienced such a revolutionary transformation of the very foundations of the civilization that the State and politics were secularized. The final chapter of the conflict, which sealed the fate of religion in Europe, and brought an essentially godless civilization into being, was the American, French and Bolshevik Revolutions. The sphere of religion was reduced to individual and group worship, and the Pope and Euro-Christianity were excluded as actors in the conduct of State. God was no longer recognized to be sovereign (*al-Akbar*). Instead it was the people who were sovereign, and they vested that sovereignty in the new secular model of a State. The State was now *al-Akbar.* For Europe that was secularism. For Islam, the religion, it was *Shirk,* the greatest of all sins!

It was strange that non-European Christianity did not put up a great struggle against this destruction of the sacred model of a State created by the Prophets David and Solomon (peace be upon them both).

Godless European civilization has embarked upon a crusade to transform the entire world and to remold it after the new European model of the secular State and godless society. The rest of the world was colonized or had its essential freedom taken away. And so the non-European world also, was eventually secularized and is fast being reduced to a godless society. This included the world of Islam. In fact the world of Islam was the special target of godless European civilization.

The process of reducing the world of Islam to a godless society commenced with the secularization of public life. The Ottoman Empire was targeted. It had to be destroyed. But it could not be destroyed so long as the Caliphate remained a powerful institution of unity for Muslims. And so the Caliphate had to be destroyed.

The destruction of the Ottoman Empire, which was effected in the First World War, resulted in the emergence of the secular State of Turkey. The government was constituted of secularized westernized Turkish nationalists who worked hand-in-glove with an under-ground Jewish movement. They first reduced the Caliphate to an office that resembled that of the Pope, and then abolished it. But the secularization process in the world of Islam was sealed when the *Hejaz*, under the rule of Abdul Aziz ibn Saud, also joined Mustafa Kamal (Ataturk) in the rejection of the

supremacy of Islam over the State. And so Arabia, the heartland of Islam, also embraced of the secular model of a State. The birth of the State of Saudi Arabia coincided with the destruction of the *Dar al-Islam* that had been established by the Prophet Muhammad (peace and blessings of Allah be upon him).

While the *Hejaz* was *Dar al-Islam* every Muslim had the right to enter that territory, - he did not need a visa. There was no such thing as Saudi sovereignty. There was no such thing as Saudi citizenship. The right of entry into any part of *Dar al-Islam* was one of several rights which Muslims had, such as the right to reside in *Dar al-Islam,* - they did not need residence permits, the right to seek livelihood in any part of *Dar al-Islam*, they did not need a work permits etc. The birth of the State of Saudi Arabia resulted in the denial and eventual elimination of all these rights of Muslims.

The destruction of the Caliphate and the emergence of the State of Saudi Arabia were events that changed the very face of the world of Islam in such a way as to result in a return to the pre-*hijri* stage of Islamic civilization. Nowhere in the world today does *Dar al-Islam* exist.

It would, we believe, be correct to assert that the basic difference that existed between pre-*Hijri* and post-*Hijri* Islam was the establishment by the Prophet *(sallalahu 'alahi wa sallam)* of *Dar al-Islam* (the Islamic Public Order) in Madina. But the world of Islam, like the rest of the non-European world, has today been incorporated into a secular and materialist system of political organization constituted of the unit of the

modern secular nation-State. As a consequence, *Dar al-Islam* no longer exists today, not even in Makkah and Madina. We are therefore justified in concluding that the world of Islam has in effect returned, in its collective existence as an *Ummah,* to pre-*Hijri* Islam.

Islamic civilization now appears to have entered into the post-caliphate era of its history. And, as it was in Makkah fourteen hundred years ago, so too today, - the Muslim community around the world is subjected to an all-embracing *Jahiliyah* that dominates the world. That *Jahiliyah* is, of course, modern post-Christian western secular and materialist western civilization.

It was, perhaps, with particular reference to this age, that the Prophet of Islam *(sallalahu 'alaihi wa sallam)* is reported to have said: "Whosoever dies without having witnessed (during his lifetime) (the institution of) *Baiy'ah* (the oath of allegiance by the people through which an appointment to the position of leadership over the *Ummah* is legitimized) has certainly died a death of *jahiliyah* (i.e., a death in an age which has witnessed the return to the pre-*hijri jahiliyah*)".

This *Hadith* of the Prophet *(sallalahu 'alaihi wa sallam)* was considered to be of such authenticity and paramount importance that it was used by *Al-Azhar* University to justify the call for an international Islamic Caliphate Conference in Cairo which would respond in an appropriate way to the decision of the Turkish Grand National Assembly, in March 1924, to abolish the Caliphate.

The Conference itself, which was held in 1926, adopted resolutions which incorporated this statement of the Prophet *(sallalahu ‘alaihi wa sallam)* and affirmed the necessity of the institution of the Caliphate, and hence, the Islamic Public Order, for the world of Islam.

The challenge before the *Ummah* today is plain and clear. It is to attempt to repeat the original movement of the *Ummah* and, thus, to travel **from Makkah to Madina once again.** In doing so the *Ummah* will re-realize the establishment of *Dar al-Islam* (Islamic Public Order). If this *Ummah* is ever to succeed in restoring the supremacy of Islam over the State in the world of Islam, it is imperative that Muslims be aware of the history of collapse of the Caliphate and its replacement, in the heartland of Islam, by the secular Saudi-Wahhabi nation-State.

This study is of even more strategic importance because the enemy who destroyed the Caliphate now have their eyes trained on the *Hajj*. The *Hajj* has been performed uninterruptedly since it was established by the Prophet Abraham *(‘alaihi al-Salām)* thousands of years ago. The *Hajj* continued even when Arabia had embraced idolatry. The enemies of Islam now have as one of their supreme long-term objectives, the termination of the *Hajj*.

Abu Said al-Khudri has narrated a *Hadith* of the Prophet *(sallalahu ‘alahi wa sallam)* in which he, the Prophet, has declared that:

"The people will continue to perform the Hajj and Umrah to the Ka'aba even after the appearance of Y’ajūj (Gog) and M’ajūj (Magog)." Shu'ba narrated, in

addition: The (last) hour will not be established until the Hajj to the Ka'aba is abandoned."

(Bukhāri)

Our study of the subject has led us to conclude that the goal of stopping the *Hajj* is now within the grasp of the enemies of Islam. All that is required for that goal to be achieved is that *Masjid al-Aqsa* be destroyed. The Jewish State of Israel can do that at anytime. It is just a matter of choosing the opportune moment. The present Saudi regime has been cunningly drawn into a non-reversible position vis-a-vis the Jewish State. The destruction of *Masjid al-Aqsa* will result in greater opposition for the Saudis. They will not be able to control the rage that Muslims will express at the time of the *Hajj.* And yet if they are seen as unable to control the *Hajj* then the internal opposition within Saudi Arabia will put the *Hajj* to effective use in destabilizing the regime. This is the scenario that will most likely lead the Saudis to stop the *Hajj* in order to preserve their rule.

If the world of Islam were to lose the *Hajj,* after having lost the Caliphate, it would constitute yet another massive step back to the *Jahiliyyah* of *pre-Hijri* Makkah. Our security predicament will become just as precarious as it was in *pre-Hijri* Makkah. Only the strongest possible *Imān* will survive that terrible test! What can we do about it? The first step that must be taken in any possible counter-strategy must be to study and critically evaluate the history of that period wherein the Caliphate was lost. This is what we attempt to do in this book.

CHAPTER ONE

BRITISH DIPLOMACY AND THE ATTACK ON THE CALIPHATE

Allah, the All-powerful, sent the perfected religion of Islam with the Prophet Muhammad *(sallalahu 'alahi wa sallam)* that it might establish its supremacy over all rivals. This required the prior submission by the *Ummah*, to the supremacy of Islam in both the private and public life of Muslims.

The office of the Caliphate (*Khilafat*) functioned as the ultimate symbol of Islam as a dominant force in public life. Without the Caliphate the world of Islam would never have power. There was, however, a permanent link between the Caliphate and control over the *Haramain*, i.e., the sacred territories in Makkah and Madina. Anyone who could succeed in severing that link would cripple the institution of the Caliphate and, eventually, render the world of Islam powerless!

Throughout the 1400 years of the history of the *Ummah* of the Prophet Muhammad, no one has ever been successfully appointed to the Caliphate, and has had his appointment legitimized by the *Baiy'ah,* or oath of allegiance of the Muslims, without such a person having had either actual control, or the capacity to exercise control, over the *Hejaz* in general and the *Haramain* in particular. The office of the Caliphate, and authority

over the *Haramain*, have always been inseparably linked in the religio-political consciousness of the *Ummah.*

The inseparable link also had a foundation in the *Shariah* in so far as the *Hajj* was an institution equally binding on all the members of the *Ummah*, and *Hajj* involved physical travel to the *Hejaz.* No one, therefore could be recognized to be the supreme leader of the Muslims who did not have the authority and the means of exercising responsibility for the organization and administration of the *Hajj*. And this, of course, included freedom and security for the pilgrims and, hence, required control over the *Hejaz.* As a consequence, even when the seat of the Caliphate was shifted from the *Hejaz* to Kufa (Iraq), Damascus, Baghdad, Cairo and even Istanbul, the *Khulafa* (i.e., Caliphs) always took the greatest care to maintain their authority and control over the *Hejaz*. This basically continued uninterruptedly until the demise of the Ottoman Islamic Empire in the First World War.

Now the enemies of Islam paid very careful attention to the study and understanding of the link between the Caliphate, the power of Islam as a world-wide force, and control over the *Haramain*, and then planned their diabolical strategy to render Islam powerless, and to confine it to a personal private faith with no authority over public life. In other words they planned their strategy to secularize Islam and so reduce Muslims to the godless European way of life.

If Western civilization was ever to succeed in finally defeating and controlling Islam, and in incorporating the entire world of Islam into the

new secular international order that had been established by the West, the strategy required that *Hejaz* should be subjected to Western influence in order that the Caliphate might be weakened and eventually eliminated. So long as the Caliphate survived it would always remain a sore in the eyes of the West, a manifestation of the authority of Islam over public life, a powerful symbol of the Theo centric Islamic Public Order and of *Pax Islamica*, and a rallying point through which the world of Islam could always be mobilized into a potent fighting force. There was an inseparable link between 'power' and the Caliphate in Islam!

The British, realizing the paramount importance of the *Hejaz* and the *Haramain* for the legitimacy and even survival of the Ottoman Caliphate, concentrated their diplomacy in the First World War on wresting the *Hejaz* from the control of the Ottoman Caliph. This was achieved when *Sharif* Husain, the Ottoman-appointed *Sharif* of Makkah and great grandfather of the present King Husain of Jordan, was successfully induced by the British to rebel against the Ottoman Caliph and to establish his own authority over the *Hejaz* under benign British alliance and protection.

By 1916, and in the very midst of the First World War, the Ottoman Caliph had lost control over Makkah and Jeddah, i.e., the lower *Hejaz.* His control over Madina was maintained throughout the war and only came to an end in 1919 when certain Ottoman troops within the city of Madina were induced to rebel against their heroic leader, Fakhri Pasha.<1>

After the Ottoman Caliph had lost control over the *Hejaz,* the Caliphate was so crippled that it lingered on in Istanbul for a just a few more years

before it collapsed completely. And this was a truly outstanding success for British diplomacy. The weakening of the Caliphate destabilized the entire structure of the Ottoman Islamic Empire. It eventually collapsed. In 1919 British troops, under the leadership of General Allenby, captured Jerusalem. It is significant that Allenby, upon entering the Holy City, proclaimed that *"the crusades are now finally over"*. If there was any doubt whatsoever of the extreme danger to Islam posed by British diplomacy in the Arabian Peninsula, this statement of Allenby should have put those doubts to rest.

What Allenby meant was that Islam was now a tiger without teeth. Its fate was to remain permanently powerless and, therefore, incapable of responding to the loss of Jerusalem in the manner in which Salahuddin Ayyubi (Saladin) had responded when Jerusalem was lost to the Crusaders.

Arabs had fought with Allenby to wrest Jerusalem from the rule of the Ottoman Caliph. Those Arabs were now waiting to ravage the carcass left by the British victory over Istanbul. They coveted local rule over the *Hejaz*, but it was still necessary to wait and see whether the Ottoman Caliph would ever be able to regain the strength necessary to seek to reimpose his rule over the *Hejaz*. When, on March 3, 1924, the Ottoman Caliphate was abolished, it became clear that no such threat existed. And it was precisely on that day that the clients of Britain began their fight over the carcass left by their betrayal of the Ottoman Islamic rule.

On March 7, 1924, *Sharif* al-Husain pre-emtively claimed the Caliphate for himself. His most important credential was that he exercised de facto local control over the *Hejaz.* He also boasted of being *Hashimite* i.e., belonging to the same clan - *Banu Hashim,* of the tribe of the Quraish to which the Prophet himself belonged. In fact this weighed so heavily amongst the *Ulama* that the Chief *Qadi* of Transjordan promptly accepted the claim and recognized Husain as Caliph.

His other credential, which was of dubious value amongst the Muslim masses, but which weighed heavily in the power-politics of the peninsula, was that the *Sharif* was an ally of Britain, the super-power of the day, and had received considerable financial, diplomatic and military support from Britain in his successful rebellion against Ottoman authority in the *Hejaz.*
In claiming the Caliphate for himself *Sharif* Husain committed the monstrous blunder of not first seeking the permission of the British to act as he did. It is the essence of the client-State status that freedom is effectively curtailed. *Sharif* Husain had violated the basic rule of conduct for client-States. How would the British react?

Now British diplomacy in *Jaziratul Arab* (i.e., the Arabian peninsula) was multi-dimensional and yet integrated. There was, first of all, the objective of wresting control of the *Haramain* from the Caliph. This was meant to weaken his legitimacy, and thus his influence and control over the rest of the world of Islam, and so facilitate the defeat of the Ottomans in the world war. Secondly Britain wanted a friendly regime in control of the *Hejaz* so that it could better be able to manipulate the politics of the peninsula. Finally, the politics of the peninsula and the defeat of the

Ottomans were strategically linked to Zionism's efforts to build a diabolical consensus with Britain in the pursuit of the creation of a Jewish National Home in Palestine. And this integrated diplomacy was finally made clear with the Sykes-Picot Agreement of 1916 and the Balfour Declaration of 1917.

The `super-power' (of the day) and the so-called `chosen people' would hence be locked in an embrace of truly momentous consequences for them and for the rest of mankind.

The objective of the integrated diplomacy was to dismantle the entire Islamic Public Order so as to render Islam powerless to prevent Zionism from achieving its goal. Already the Islamic institutions integrally related to the Islamic Public Order, *Ahl al-Dhimmah* and *al-Jizyah*, <2> had been abolished in the Ottoman Islamic Empire in 1855 as a direct consequence of European pressure. But so long as the institution of the Caliphate remained it was always possible for the Islamic Public Order to linger on and, eventually, be revived. The attack on the institution of the Caliphate was, therefore, a vital necessary if the ultimate Euro-Jewish goal was ever to be achieved.

It was also quite clear to the British and the Zionists that a Jewish National Home, - the Jewish State of Israel, could not be established in Muslim Palestine, and could never hope to survive so long as the world of Islam had a Caliph capable of mobilizing its formidable resources and religious fervor and directing it to military ends. And so the control over the Hejaz,

which was of paramount importance in the politics of the peninsula, was a matter to which British diplomacy directed supreme attention.

But the claim to the Caliphate by the Hashimite, Sharif al-Husain, was incompatible with British diplomatic objectives because it was always possible that the claim could have succeeded. Sharif al-Husain could then have mobilized the world of Islam to such an extent as to re-establish the Islamic Public Order and *Pax Islamica* in the symbolically powerful heartland of Islam, and so pose a threat to Britain's influence and control over large parts of *Dar al-Islam*. A revitalized world of Islam would also have made Jewish control over Palestine and Jerusalem quite impossible.

And so Britain gave her blessings to the other British client in the peninsula, Abd al-Aziz Ibn Saud, to move against Husain and to wrest control of the *Hejaz* from him. This was the perfection of the art of double-crossing and of hypocrisy. One client was used to eliminate another client.

Britain had cultivated Ibn Saud's friendship and alliance during the war and, as usual, had employed financial diplomacy (i.e., bribery). Ibn Saud received a monthly sum of 5000 pounds sterling from the British Treasury in return for his benevolent neutrality in Husain's rebellion against the Caliph, the imposition of Hashimite rule over the *Hejaz*, and Britain's diplomatic and military efforts in the peninsula directed against the Ottoman Islamic State. He diabolically rationalized this manifest violation of the command of Allah Most High and His Prophet by explaining it away the bribe as *Jizyah*. <3> (Qur'an 5:51)

But British diplomacy in respect of Ibn Saud was directed to ends of far greater strategic importance than mere benevolent neutrality in the war and the disposal of the injudicious *Sharif* Husain. Ibn Saud had a far greater potential that Britain now moved to exploit, consequent on Sharif Husain's claim to the Caliphate.

The Saudi power in the *Nejd,* which had re-emerged with the capture of *Riyadh* in 1902, was the product of an old alliance between a tribal chief and the religious leader of the puritanical fanatical Wahhabi religious sect. That alliance ensured that while the descendants of the tribal chief would wield political power over territory ruled by the alliance, religious affairs would be subject to the authority of the descendants of the religious chief. As a consequence it was inevitable that the *Najdi* Saudis would be under pressure from the Wahhabis to seek to force the submission of the heart-land of Islam (the *Hejaz*) to the Wahhabi perception of the true faith.

Britain was only too pleased to give the green light to Ibn Saud to move his forces against Husain four days after the Hashemite had claimed the Caliphate for himself. Ibn Saud was impatient to move against Husain since, as strange as it may appear, both Jewish control over Jerusalem and Wahhabi control over *Hejaz* faced a similar threat. Neither could either be achieved or could hope to survive if the world of Islam had a Caliph.

By supporting Ibn Saud the British were now ensuring that so long as the Saudi-Wahhabis ruled over the *Hejaz* the Caliphate could never be revived. The British further calculated that without the Caliphate the

Islamic Public Order could not survive and the world of Islam would then be so weakened that it could never be mobilized to prevent the creation of the Jewish State of Israel. Britain also knew that the Wahhabis, themselves, could never claim the Caliphate since a Wahhabi Caliph would always be totally unacceptable to the overwhelming majority of Muslims the world over. And so, by withdrawing support from Husain and supporting Ibn Saud, Britain was in fact pursuing her relentless attack on the institution of the Caliphate and the theocentric Islamic Public Order.

Within a few months Ibn Saud was able to conquer Makkah, and Husain fled to Jeddah. The British eventually intervened to remove him physically from the peninsula by offering him a comfortable exile in Cyprus. And soon Madina and Jeddah were also under Saudi-Wahhabi rule.

More than a century earlier, however, the Saudi-Wahhabi alliance had succeeded in overcoming the defenses of Taif and Makkah and there ensued a blood-bath of truly astonishing proportions. The Wahhabis, in their fanatical zeal, considered the Muslims resident in the *Hejaz* to be *Mushriqoon* (i.e., a people guilty of the crime of blasphemy) and, as a consequence, held that it was permissible to kill them. The Caliph in Istanbul got the Mamluke Khedive of Egypt, Muhammad Ali, to send an army to the *Hejaz* under the leadership of his son Ismail. The Saudi-Wahhabi warriors were unceremoniously driven out of *Hejaz* and into the desert. A century later, however, there was no Caliph and all the powerful Muslim communities were under western colonial rule. In addition, Ibn Saud enjoyed the protecting friendship of Great Britain, the super-power of the day. There was, therefore, no immediate possibility

whatsoever of dislodging the Saudi-Wahhabi forces from the *Haramain* and *Hejaz*.

Although Ibn Saud was safely in control of *Hejaz* he was still confronted with a truly formidable problem at the commencement of his rule over the *Hejaz* in 1924. Namely, he had to devise some strategy that could avert the long-term possibility of a repetition of the disaster that visited the previous Saudi-Wahhabi rule over the *Hejaz*. It would appear that he first thought of a policy of conciliation with non-Wahhabi Muslims and of using his control over the *Hejaz* to further the cause of the unity of the *Ummah*. Thus shortly after gaining control over Makkah and receiving from its inhabitants their recognition of him as *Sultan* of the *Hejaz*, he issued a proclamation to the entire world of Islam to the effect that the *Hejaz*, with its *Haramain,* belonged to the entire world of Islam and that he, Ibn Saud, held control over the *Hejaz* as a trust only, and on behalf of the entire world of Islam. <4> He then went on to invite the entire world of Islam to send its representatives to Makkah so that, on the basis of *Shura* (consultation) and *Ijma* (consensus), a just, efficient and representative administration could be established over the *Hejaz*.

This important announcement was entirely consistent with the provisions of the Islamic Public Order. The *Hejaz* was still the *Dar al-Islam* that had been established by the Prophet. As yet there was no hint of any Saudi State that would claim `territorial sovereignty' over the *Hejaz*. The rights of the Muslims in the territory of *Dar al-Islam* were being publicly recognized and respected.

But unfortunately this concern for the unity of the world of Islam and this fervent declaration concerning the status of the *Hejaz* did not represent the actual Saudi-Wahhabi designs over the *Hejaz*. It was simply a case of `politics of expediency' and was designed to protect the Saudi-Wahhabis in the wake of a significant initiative undertaken by *Al-Azhar* University in Cairo shortly after the abolition of the Ottoman Caliphate. Indeed the Azhar initiative had perilous implications for Ibn Saud and the Saudi-Wahhabi rule over the *Hejaz*. It also constituted a troublesome `fly in the ointment' for the victorious Zionists and British. *Al-Azhar* proposed to convene an International Islamic Caliphate Congress (*Mu'tamar al-Khilafah*) in Cairo which would, among other things, attempt to appoint a new Caliph over the world of Islam.

Had the Wahhabis been genuinely devoted to Islam they would have welcomed this *Al-Azhar* effort to achieve conformity with an essential requirement of the *Shariah,* i.e., the establishment of a genuine Caliphate. The Wahhabis had long argued that the post-Rashidoon Caliphate was invalid because, among other things, the Caliphate was not constituted in a manner that conformed with the requirements of the *Shariah*. Now that the invalid Caliphate had been abolished and the leading center of Islamic learning was convening an international Islamic congress to discuss the question of the Caliphate and to effect the appointment of a new Caliph, the Wahhabis should not only have welcomed this initiative but should also have extended every possible cooperation and should have participated in a serious way in the Congress in order to ensure that the genuine Caliphate was restored.

But the Wahhabis had no such sincere devotion to Islam. Their attitude was essentially one of selective religiosity, expediency, opportunism and parochialism. The Wahhabis knew that the world of Islam would never have accepted a Wahhabi Caliph and, as a consequence, they found it expedient to repudiate an essential requirement of the Islamic Public Order. They marshaled all their energies to sabotage the Cairo Caliphate Congress. Their strategy was to organize a rival congress in Makkah at the time of the *Hajj* of 1926. That meant that the Makkah Congress would take place within a month of Cairo Congress, making it difficult for delegates to attend both conferences. Since the Makkah Conference was timed to coincide with the *Hajj,* and since it had the active support of the British, it had a clear advantage over the Cairo Conference.

Secondly they specifically excluded from the agenda of the Makkah Congress the question of the Caliphate. This transparent attempt to sabotage the Cairo Conference and to bury the Caliphate was more than ample evidence to expose the hollow credentials of the Wahhabis as so-called champions of the *Shariah* and of Islam.

The response of the world of Islam to this rivalry, i.e., the Cairo Caliphate Congress of May/June 1926 and the rival Makkah World Muslim Congress of July 1926, is a subject that deserves serious research. How much British diplomacy was involved in ensuring, for example, that the important Muslim community of India which had supported the Ottoman Caliphate to such an extent that they had established the formidable Caliphate Movement, would stay away from the Caliphate Congress of Cairo and, instead, attend the rival Makkah Congress from the agenda of

which the question of the Caliphate was specifically excluded? Very little research has been done on this subject.

What was clear, however, was that in this rivalry the Makkah Congress achieved a tactical victory over Cairo, - a victory that had enormous implications for the very survival of the institution of the Caliphate and the orthodox Islamic Public Order (i.e., *Dar al-Islam*). Those who organized the Cairo Congress wished to ensure conformity with the orthodox Islamic system of political organization. But they were intellectually incapable of articulating a conception of the Islamic Public Order (*Dar al-Islam*) and the Islamic Conception of an International Order that could convince a skeptical world of Islam.

Those who organized the Makkah Congress, on the other hand, were unwilling, because of vested interests, to remain faithful to the orthodox Islamic Public Order with its Caliphate, *Dar al-Islam* etc. Instead they chose to accept the rival system of political organization which had emerged in modern western civilization and which had just penetrated the very seat of the Ottoman caliphate, - namely the secular nation-State system. And they did so because it was only in the nation-State system that the Saudi-Wahhabis could realistically pursue an effort to win recognition and legitimacy for their rule over the *Hejaz* and thus ensure the survival of the Saudi State. They camouflaged their true designs and made an elaborate attempt to dupe the world of Islam. And their success in this game of deception was amply demonstrated in the representative character of the Makkah Congress.

The tactical victory of the Makkah Congress in its rivalry with the Cairo Congress played a significant role in paving the way for the rest of the world of Islam, including the very heart-land of Islam, to eventually follow the example of Mustafa Kamal and his model of the secular State of Turkey. The history of the world of Islam since 1924 records, on the one hand, the evils which were continuously injected into the body of the *Ummah* through this alien system of political organization and, on the other, the naive, confused and superficial attempts of modern Islamic scholarship to reconstruct a new Islamic Public Order on the secular foundations of the nation-State system.

What emerged from those efforts was the goal of `Islamisation' and of establishing `the Islamic State' within the system of nation-States. But both of these were futile goals for it was, and still is, impossible for them to be achieved without first dismantling some of the essential apparatus of the nation-State, - essential, that is, for its survival as a secular institution.

Both Dr Muhammad Iqbal and *Maulana* Abul Ala Maududi ventured into *Ijtihad* (i.e., independent reasoning) to reconstruct an Islamic Public Order in post-Caliphate Islam. Their efforts resulted in the concept of `the Islamic State'. Unfortunately, however, the efforts for establishing the Islamic State resulted in the orthodox Islamic system of the political organization of the *Ummah* or the Islamic Public Order (i.e., *Pax Islamica* and *Dar al-Islam*) being relegated to total obscurity. As a consequence political thought in the world of Islam was gravely misdirected, and the immense confusion so created persists to the present day.

CHAPTER TWO

THE COLLAPSE OF THE OTTOMAN CALIPHATE AND THE RISE OF THE SECULAR SAUDI-WAHHABI NATION-STATE

The First World War and the Abolition of the Ottoman Caliphate

In so far as the Muslim World was concerned the first world war was much more than a mere European war. It was, rather, a war which brought about upheavals and changes in the Muslim World which were unprecedented in its thirteen hundred years of existence.

Firstly, the greatest Muslim power and seat of the contemporary Caliphate, the Ottoman Islamic Empire, entered the war on the side of the Central Powers. While this decision is still clouded in some controversy since, up to the very last moment, the Ottoman leadership had not decided whether to enter the war or not, and if so, which side to support, there were grounds for speculating about a possible British-Zionist role in the affair.

The Jewish-Zionist leaders had made a number of unsuccessful efforts at striking a deal with the Caliph for Jewish control over Jerusalem. They

even offered to buy the holy city. Britain had supported these Jewish-Zionist efforts.

Among Britain's major political and military goals in the war were the subjugation of Islam as a power in the world, the conquest of Jerusalem, and the creation in Palestine of a Jewish homeland that would constantly disrupt and police the Muslim Middle East on behalf of the West.

The Ottoman leadership predictably attempted to mobilize support for its war effort from the entire Muslim world. In this connection, on November 23, 1914 the *Shaikh al-Islam* of the Ottoman Islamic State issued a fatwa and a proclamation declaring jihad and commanding all Muslims to fight against the Allied Powers. British diplomacy, however, succeeded in promoting and exploiting Arab nationalism in the Arabian Peninsula as an effective means of attacking and undermining the formidable strength of universal Islamic fraternity. As a consequence the Arabs rebelled against Ottoman rule on the basis of a British offer of assistance to achieve national independence.

In less than two years after the commencement of the war Sharif al-Husain, self-styled `King of the Arabs', firm ally of the British, and great-grandfather of Jordan's King Husain, had successfully rebelled against the Ottoman authority and was installed as King of the *Hejaz*, the heart-land of Islam. And as a consequence of the loss of the cities of Makkah and, eventually, Madina, the pan-Islamic appeal of the Ottoman Caliph suffered irreparable damage.

The British followed up their success in the *Hejaz* by installing the sons of Husain as Kings in Iraq and Transjordan as well. And by 1919 the British General, Allenby, with Arab troops fighting loyally with him, marched triumphantly into Jerusalem and declared that the crusades had finally come to an end. Palestine remained a British Mandate territory (mandated by the League of Nations) until the British withdrew in 1948 and the Zionist Jews declared the establishment of the State of Israel.

The Ottoman Islamic Empire was badly defeated in the war. The Allied Powers combined their military prowess with a psychological weapon that had far-reaching effects for Islam. The British and French succeeded in winning Islamic military support (by means more foul than fair) from India, the Maghrib and other areas and so both Arab and non-Arab Muslims fought against their brother Muslim Turks. The result was that the Ottoman Islamic Empire was not only defeated but its universal Islamic foundations were destroyed.

Out of the ashes of Ottoman defeat in the first world war the secular Turkish nationalist forces, led by Mustafa Kamal, fought a "war after the war" with such courage, brilliance and determination that the war-weary European powers, restrained from intervening by their own domestic public opinion, could do nothing to prevent the Turks from inflicting a crushing defeat on the Greeks and in winning Turkish freedom. The Treaty of Lausanne, signed in 1924, gave international recognition to that which had been won by Turkish arms on the battlefield.

The Turkish Nationalists and the Caliphate

The Turkish nationalist forces had been in constant conflict with the Sultan-Caliph for more than fifty years, struggling to limit his powers through a constitutional order which would replace what they considered to be an autocratic dictatorship. The Turkish nationalist forces were essentially secular in their political outlook and were deeply impressed by what they perceived to be the evident superiority of Western civilization over the Ottoman Caliphate and Islamic Empire.

In the wake of the loss of the cities of Makkah and Madina, and after brother-Muslims had fought against them in the war, they now felt themselves free from any impelling attachment to the world of Islam. And they moved swiftly to transform their political order from the old model of *Dar al-Islam*, or the Islamic Public Order, to the western model of a modern secular nation-State, the Republic of Turkey.

In such a transformation it was, and still is, inevitable that there should be some form of separation of `church` from `state` - for this was the very foundation of the western model.<5> The new Turkish Grand National Assembly, faithful to the new model it was introducing, appointed Abdul Mageed as Caliph in 1922 to serve as head of the Islamic `Church'. His Caliphate, however, was shorn of all temporal power. These were vested in the State.

It was just as inevitable that the new model should break down in the Islamic milieu of Turkey. It was not, and still is not, possible to do with Islam what the Europeans had done with Christianity after the break-up of

the Holy Roman Empire. The Caliph was not, and could not be, the equivalent of the Pope. <6> There could be no accommodation of political secularism in the Islamic system since orthodox Islam recognized no division between the Church and the State. Indeed there was no such thing as an Islamic `Church'.

It quickly became evident that the new model of a modern nation-State could not emerge while the institution of the Caliphate remained. There also appeared signs (like the British support for the Caliphate Movement in India) that the enemies of the Kemalist Republic might seek to use the Caliph to destabilize the Republic and eventually to remove Mustafa Kamal. The Turkish nationalist forces quickly and clearly understood that the nation-State in the Islamic milieu either had to summon the courage to take control of Islam and subordinate Islam to the State or suffer the fate (i.e., from their perspective) of having Islam take control of the State and restore *Dar al-Islam*.

It was no surprise, therefore, when the Turkish Grand National Assembly adopted, on March 3, 1924, another law abolishing the Caliphate. Article 1 of the Law stated:

"The Caliph is deposed. The office of the Caliphate is abolished, since the Caliphate is essentially comprised in the meaning and signification of the words Government (*Hukumah*) and Republic (*Jumhuriyyah*)".<7>

The passage of this law marked a decisive moment in the history of the *Ummah*. After a period of thirteen hundred years during which the

institution of the Caliphate was almost universally recognized by Muslims (i.e., sunni Muslims) as essential to their religion, even when the seat of the Caliphate was filled in ways which were contrary to the principles of Islam, the world of Islam found itself in the fourteenth century of its existence without a Caliph. Indeed so definite and permanent was the change that one could, perhaps, be forgiven for concluding that the world of Islam had now passed into the post-Caliphate period of its existence.

The Response of Al-Azhar University to the Abolition of the Ottoman Caliphate

The significance of the abolition of the Caliphate was to be found in the very Article One of the Law of Abolition, to wit, the Caliphate was being replaced by the modern secular nation-State. An institution considered to be a part of the religion of Islam was being replaced, under the impact of western political thought and civilization, by a political system which belonged to the western world, and terminology (*Hukumah* and *Jumhuriyyah*) used in the old orthodox model were now being used in a new sense to fit the new model. As great a thinker as Dr. Muhammad Iqbal appears not to have adequately understood the true nature of the change which was taking place. <8>

To the extent that the Caliphate formed part of the religion of Islam it was very clear that a massive and (from the religious viewpoint) quite

reprehensible bid'ah was being perpetrated and this required an appropriate religious response. Twenty-two days after the passage of the law in the Turkish Grand National Assembly, the Rector of *Al-Azhar* University in Cairo met with the leading ulama of the University and of Egypt and the following declaration concerning the Caliphate was issued:

"The Caliphate, which is synonymous with the Imamate, is a general leadership (ri'asah) in matters of al-Din and of al-Duniya. Its fundamental function is to watch over the interests of the millat and over the administration of the Ummah".

The declaration located this `general leadership' in the office of the Imam who was defined as:

" . . . the deputy of the promulgator of the religious law for the defense of the faith, for the application of its precepts and for the administration of mundane affairs as the shari'ah provides.

"The Imam becomes the Imam in virtue of the payment of allegiance (bay'ah) on the part of those with the power to `loose and bind` (ahl al-halli wal-aqd) <9> or else being chosen by his predecessor to succeed him.

"The Imamate can also be acquired by conquest in the sense that if another party masters the Caliph and usurps his place, the Caliph loses his office. Sometimes acquisition by conquest is reinforced by payment of allegiance or by the choice of the preceding Caliph as was the case with the majority of the Caliphs of the past." <10>

Turning to the concrete situation facing them, the declaration condemned as bid'ah without precedent in Islam, first the appointment of Abdul

Majeed to a Caliphate stripped of its temporal power, - this being assumed by the Turkish Grand National Assembly, and secondly the abolition of the Caliphate.

Since these *Bid'ah* were totally incompatible with the tenets of the faith, the ulama concluded that an Islamic Congress should be convened, to which representatives of all Muslim peoples should be invited, in order to consider on whose shoulders the Islamic Caliphate ought to be placed.

This then was the first serious response of the world of Islam to the abolition of the Ottoman Caliphate. But it is important to note that the proposal represented a significant departure from traditional political behavior in the orthodox model of Islam. One might even describe it as bid'ah. The Azhar ulama were proposing to use an Islamic Congress, albeit with representatives of all Muslim peoples participating, to appoint a new Caliph. Not since the first half of the first century of Islamic history had a Caliph been elected by the people. And never in the entire history of Islam had he ever been elected by an Assembly or Congress representative of all the Islamic peoples.<11>

The proposal encountered such difficulties that the Committee charged with planning for the Congress substituted the explosive issue of the election of a new Caliph for the less controversial and more practical subject of an analysis of the situation and possible responses. What is of the greatest importance, however, is that for the first time since the very earliest period of the history of Muslim polity the idea was publicly advanced by a prestigious body of learned Muslims that the most

important affairs of the *Ummah* could be discussed and decisions taken by an assembly or congress representative of all Muslim peoples.

It is extremely difficult to determine whether this can be attributed to the influence of western civilization, as Toynbee would have us believe. <12> It nevertheless remains true that to the extent that the proposed Congress would have utilized shura and ijma it would have been closer to orthodox Islam than the Caliphate as all but the first few decades of its existence depicted it.

CHAPTER THREE

THE CALIPHATE CONFERENCE, CAIRO - May 1926

Agenda

The Caliphate Congress, which finally met in Cairo in May 1926, had on its agenda the examination of the following items:

1. "The definition of the Caliphate and of the qualifications required in the Caliph.
2. Is the Caliphate a necessity in Islam?
3. How is the Caliphate contracted?
4. Is it possible at the present time to constitute a Caliphate that fulfills all the requirements of the shari'ah?
5. Supposing that the answer to the fourth point is in the negative, what action should be taken?
6. Supposing that the Congress decides that it is necessary to appoint a Caliph, what steps should be taken to give effect to this decision?"

Delegates

The delegates who attended the Congress came from Egypt, Libya, Tunisia, Morocco, South Africa, Dutch East Indies (now Indonesia), Yemen, *Hejaz* (now in Saudi Arabia), Palestine, Iraq and Poland. Conspicuously absent were delegates from many important Islamic

countries and communities, - Turkey, Persia (now Iran), Afghanistan, *Nejd* (now in Saudi Arabia) and the Muslim communities of Russia, China and India.

Turkey declined the invitation to attend with the cold reply that the country had no Caliphate problem. Persia, a *Shia* country, evinced no interest in the *Sunni* Caliphate Congress. The Muslims of Russia, China and India, all minorities living in hostile environments, adopted a common attitude. They stayed away from the Cairo conference of May 1926, regarding it as a mere academic exercise, a gathering devoid of any real power and unlikely to offer them any tangible assistance and protection. But they did so primarily because a rival conference had been arranged by one who appeared to be a real power, 'Abd al-Aziz ibn Saud. In fact he was, himself, in mortal fear of the re-emergence of the Caliphate since he had just wrested control of the holy cities of Makkah and Madina for his royal house.

Finally, among the delegates present in Cairo, was the head of the Sanusi (sufi) Order, al-Sayyed Idris al-Sanusi, designated as *Amir* of Barka and Tripoli. It was rumored that there was a strong possibility of him being elected as Caliph if the Congress were to decide to elect one. <13>

Congress Sessions

The Congress met in four sessions on 13th, 15th, 18th and 19th May 1926. At the first session the First Committee was appointed "to examine proposals and bring them before the Congress". The Committee immediately proposed that the proceedings of the Congress be held `in

secret'. This proposal was rejected in the fourth plenary session with the result that we possess, as a public document, the entire Verbatim Record of this Congress. <14>

The Second and Third Committees were appointed in the second plenary session, the Second Committee to examine Items 1, 2 and 3 of the Congress Agenda and the Third Committee to examine Items 4, 5 and 6. The Reports of the Second and Third Committees and the discussions and decisions based on these reports formed the very core of the work of the Congress. And it is to the analysis of these reports that we now turn.

The Second Committee

In defining the institution of the Caliphate the Second Committee relied on the authoritative writings of scholars like al-Mawardi, Ibn Khaldun and others. In particular, they laid emphasis on the fact that the Caliph must combine in his office ‘temporal’ as well as 'religious' leadership. Secondly, there can only be one Caliph at a time since, among other things, the role of the institution of the Caliphate is to unify the *Ummah*. <15>

The second question before the Committee (*Is the Caliphate a necessity in Islam?*) was, to say the least, quite incredible. Here was an institution which had always been of pivotal importance to *Sunni* Muslim polity and which had been with Muslims from the time of the death of the Prophet. In its entire history the *Ummah* had not only lived with the Caliphate but, in addition, had never seriously considered the possibility of an alternative.

Indeed, in the act of suggesting that an alternative to the Caliphate was possible, one would have been exposing one's self to the very grave charge of indulging in *Bid'ah*. And yet, in consequence of the fiat of one man, Mustafa Kamal of Turkey, here was the highest seat of learning in the entire world of Islam presenting for the consideration of the Caliphate Congress the question - *Is the Caliphate a necessity in Islam?*

And yet, perhaps, this was the most important question the *Ummah* ever had to answer in its entire history. For it turned out, inevitably, that the Committee confirmed that the Caliphate was a necessity in Islam but that it could not, at that point in time, be realized. <16> In other words, Allah had placed on the Muslims an obligation that they could not, at that time, fulfill. But this was hardly a satisfactory answer to the question since Allah, by virtue of being Omniscient, could not place on His servants an obligation they could not fulfill.

Either, then, the Caliphate was not a necessity in Islam, or it was a necessity and could not be realized. In which case failure to re-establish the Caliphate would be a collective sin for which the believers would be punished.

In respect of the third question (*How is the Caliphate achieved or constituted?*) the Committee answered as follows:

1. "By appointment by the preceding Caliph.

2. "By appointment by the classes of influential Muslims, i.e., men whom the public must obey such as ulama, amirs, notables, men of opinion and administration.
3. "By conquest by a Muslim even if he does not fulfill the other conditions." <17>

The presentation of this Report by the Second Committee led to a very important and interesting debate between Abd al-Aziz al-Effendi, a Tunisian Professor who was one of the Iraqi delegates, and *Shaikh* Muhammad al-Ahmadi al-Zawahiri, head of the Egyptian delegation, <18> on the applicability of Islamic theoretical principles and the necessity of ijtihad:

Thalibi Effendi:
"No one can dispute the fact that the question of the Caliphate is the most important and the most difficult to resolve. I therefore propose an adjournment of the Congress until next year so that we may be able to study the problem in detail and in all its aspects. It will not suffice to examine the problem from the purely theoretic point of view. Some account must be taken of the necessity of circumstances and places, (and) of the influence exerted upon Islamic institutions by the policies of certain foreign powers."

Shaikh al-Zawahiri:
"In the examination of theological questions which were submitted to us, we did not wish to resort to ijtihad and to establish a new doctrine. We confined ourselves to examining the principles admitted by the recognized doctrines of Islam. As for the applicability of these principles, it is for you to declare that that is beyond our competence."

Thalibi Effendi:
"I am advocating neither a new doctrine nor ijtihad. What I seek is your opinion. If you affirm principles which are not susceptible of application in our epoch, what will be the circumstances?"

Shaikh al-Zawahiri:
"It is dangerous for Islam to raise the question of the applicability, at one epoch rather than another, of the dispositions of the *Shariah*. We feel that the application of the general principles of religion ought to be subject to no exceptions, and we consider that there is no condition to establish new conditions in deference to the exigencies of the age." <19>

Shaikh al-Zawahiri was, of course, perfectly justified in insisting that the *Shari'ah*, or divinely revealed sacred law of Islam, admitted of no revisions to suit differing situations and ages. The *Shari'ah* had to be retained in its revealed form regardless of whether or not the Muslims found themselves competent or not to apply it in a particular age. And so, for *Shaikh* Zawahiri, the restoration of the Caliphate was a religious obligation. He was quite correct!

And Thalibi Effendi was more than justified in posing the question, for which he received no answer, - to wit, if the restoration of the Caliphate is a religious duty incumbent upon Muslims, what will be the consequences for Muslims if they failed in the effort to restore the Caliphate?

The basic deficiency in the approach of both Zawahiri and Thalibi Effendi was their failure to heed the clear statement of the Qur'an to the effect that Allah sent to each religious community both a *Shariah* and a *Minhaj* (or

an open way). <20> As a consequence, in addition to the eternal unchanging sacred law to which Zawahiri rightly insists we must always be faithful, there was also the flexible *Minhaj* wherein human genius could express itself in adapting to changing situations and conditions while yet preserving the Law.

The basic problem that the Second Committee and the Congress failed to recognize and to address and, as a result, which led to the failure of the Congress, was the problem of re-examining the traditional so-called orthodox interpretation of the Islamic public order (*Dar al-Islam*) and the Islamic conception of the International Order. The institution of the Caliphate did not exist in a vacuum. It formed part of *Dar al-Islam. Dar al-Islam* no longer existed in the world in 1924. It did not exist even in Makkah and Madina. The world of Islam had returned to its *pre-Hijri* stage of existence.

The solution to the problem would be the establishment of a multiplicity of *Jama'aat* in all parts of the world of Islam, each with its own *Ameer/Imam*, with each imam receiving the *Baiy'ah* from the members of the *Jama'ah* and carefully conducting the affairs of the jama'ah, to the maximum extent possible, in a manner which conformed with the *Shariah*. Whenever the possibility arose for the Saudi-Wahhabi rule over the *Hejaz* to be ended, and for Muslims to restore true independence to the *Hejaz*, it would then be possible for *Dar al-Islam* to be restored. There would then be an *Ameer* over *Dar al-Islam*, and every other *Ameer* over every *Jama'ah* in the world would have to give the *Baiy'ah* to the *Ameer* of *Dar al-Islam*!

It was the command of the Prophet (s) that if there were two persons claiming to be *Ameer* over the *Jama'ah* of Muslims at one and the same time (i.e., in *Dar al-Islam*), then the second of the two should be killed.

It is of crucial importance to note that the verse of the Qur'an:

"Oh you who believe, obey Allah, and obey the Messenger (of Allah), and obey those in (lawfully constituted) authority from amongst you."

(Qur'an, al-Nisa, 4:59)

did not command obedience of 'he' (i.e., a single person) who was in authority. It rather required obedience of 'those' in authority. The Qur'an thus explicitly recognized the possibility of a (temporary) plurality of leadership in the *Ummah* so long as there was no *Dar al-Islam*.

In the earliest period of the history of Islam after the demise of the Prophet, the *Ummah* vested authority over the entire community in a single person. This was, and still is, indispensable for the consolidation of the Islamic polity. Indeed it was further found necessary, and for the same reason, to limit the choice of the leader to the tribe of the Quraish, the tribe to which the Prophet belonged.

Unitary leadership, however, lasted for barely a century before plurality manifested itself. And then, for the rest of its history the *Ummah* never retrieved unitary leadership. It, however, continued to exist as a theological construction for which the *Ummah* was supposed to aspire.

It should, however, be recognized that the Qur'an, in admitting the possibility of a plurality of leadership, made it possible for the *Ummah* to restore the system of unitary leadership over dar al-Islam through a gradual process which would temporarily admit a plurality of leadership over a multiplicity of *Jama'aat* so long as *Dar al-Islam* did not exist.

The Second Committee failed to examine this possibility and, as a consequence, the Congress itself ended in failure. The report of the Second Committee contained another significant defect, - a defect which belonged to the classical Islamic political theory. According to the report the office of the Caliph could be filled through the 'nomination' of the previous Caliph, or it could be seized through conquest.

Neither in the Qur'an, nor in the *Sunnah* of the Prophet, nor in the example of the *Khulafa al-Rashidun* was there any foundation whatsoever for the belief that leadership in Islam could be acquired through conquest or through the nomination of the previous Caliph. And yet it is instructive to note that through most of Islamic history and even in the contemporary Muslim world we find leadership constituted almost invariably as dynastic kingships or through conquests (modern-day military rule now forms part of `conquests').

Succeeding generations of Islamic scholars misunderstood the true nature of the alleged nomination of the second Caliph, Umar, by the first Caliph, Abu Bakr (*radiullahu 'anhu*). Indeed one suspects that many *Sunni Ulama* exploited the misconception in their centuries of post-facto theorization to

provide doctrinal legitimacy to the centuries of dynastic monarchy in Islam. In fact Abu Bakr (*radiuallah 'anhu*) nominated Umar (*radiullahu 'anhu*), not because the office of the Caliph gave him the right to do so, but because the people, who possessed the right to appoint the new Caliph, freely delegated that right to Abu Bakr (*radiullahu 'anhu*)

In fact the *Ulama* were colossally mistaken in declaring that the *Shari'ah* permitted the incumbent Caliph to appoint his successor and, as a consequence, in supporting all through the history of the Caliphate, and even to this day, such dynastic monarchies as the Ummayyads, the Abbasids, the Ottoman Caliphate, the Saudi monarchy in Saudi Arabia, the Hashemite monarchy in Jordan, the Sharifian monarchy in Morocco and the numerous Gulf monarchies.

And then, to confound matters even more, the ulama conferred on Abu Bakr, Umar, Uthman, and Ali (may Allah be pleased with them all) the title of *Khulafa al-Rashidoon* (the rightly guided Caliphs), thus confirming that there was something significantly wrong with Muawiya's Caliphate and with all those who followed him. And, of course, what was particularly striking about the Caliphate of the first four Caliphs was the total absence of even the faintest suspicion of dynastic monarchy or the acquisition of the Office through conquest. [We are aware that there are some who question the wisdom of the *ulama* in bringing down the curtain of rightly guided Caliphate upon the death of Ali. They would insist that Muawiyah be also included. They form, however, an insignificant minority within the ranks of *Sunni* Islamic scholarship].

The predicament of the *ulama* at the Caliphate Congress of 1926 was, and should still be, cause for serious concern. In 1924 they protested the abolition of the Ottoman Caliphate that was, in fact, a dynastic monarchy. And in 1926 they were utterly incapable, even at the level of conceptual analysis, of replacing the unislamic system of dynastic monarchy with a public order that conformed with the requirements of the religion.

The fundamental verse of the Qur'an concerning the dynamics of leadership in the model of Islam stated that Muslims must conduct their affairs on the basis of mutual consultation:

"And their affairs are (conducted) on the basis of mutual consultation (amongst themselves)."

(Qur'an, a-Shura, 42:58)

The basic implication of this verse was that in an Islamic community the appointment of the leader and his removal and replacement by another (which is the most important of all the collective affairs of the believers), must be effected through a process of mutual consultation amongst all the believers. In recognizing the right of the incumbent Caliph to appoint his successor or of the office of the Caliph being acquired by conquest, the *Ulama* <21> were in manifest conflict with the Qur'an since the believers were being denied a right given to them by Allah Himself.

Indeed the believers, for almost the entire history of the *Ummah*, were inflicted with an even greater injury. They were called upon to ratify (as a religious duty through the *Baiy'ah*) at the peril of their lives, appointments

to leadership they had no part whatsoever in making. For it was quite clear that refusal to ratify an appointment was considered to be an act of defiance and constituted a visible threat to the de facto Caliph who was merely seeking to legitimize his rule. <22>

The answer of the Second Committee to the question - How is the Caliphate constituted? - was deficient in another respect. The first and third methods (nomination and conquest), as we have demonstrated, were in conflict with the Qur'an and found no support from the example of the Prophet and the *Khulafa al-Rashidoon*. But even in respect of the second method mentioned, to wit - `the choice of the people', the Second Committee failed to demonstrate the machinery that could have been used in 1926 in order for this method to be applied.

Finally we may again note that the deliberations of the Second Committee clearly revealed that the Azhar *Ulama*, who did not seem to have made a study of modern thought, were actually unaware of the real nature of the modern State system which was about to be imposed on the world of Islam and to virtually captivate and imprison Muslim political consciousness.

The Third Committee

The Third Committee was far more forthright and realistic in its deliberations and courageously concluded in its report to the effect that:

". . . the Caliphate . . . is incapable of being realized at the present time in view of the situation in which Muslims find themselves. <23>

The reasons for this were:

" . . . in the first place there does not yet exist a body of authorized persons legally entitled to make the payment of allegiance (baiy'ah)". <24>

The Third Committee was here confessing that the classical machinery *(Ahl al-Halli wal-'Aqd*), supposed to be used in determining the choice of the people, was inoperable in 1926. It would have been more honest if it had also recalled that this machinery had never, in fact, properly operated in Islamic history. It was, however, honest enough to confess that:

". . . the Caliphate, in accordance with Islamic Law in the true sense of the term, existed only in early Islam." <25>

The Committee noted that the Congress had attempted to gather in Cairo the representatives of all the Islamic peoples and to consider the possibility of entrusting to them the task of electing a new Caliph. The Committee pointed out, however, that the Congress was not representative of all the world of Islam since many important sections of the world Muslim community did not send representatives. Implicit in this statement, we should note, was the implication that if the Congress could have attracted representatives from all the Islamic peoples, it could have elected a Caliph. This, despite the fact that such an election would have been the very first of its kind in the entire history of Islam.

But perhaps the most interesting of all the reasons advanced by the Third Committee to explain the impossibility of realizing the Caliphate at that particular time was the fact that:

" .... a Caliph, if appointed, would not be able to fulfill his basic obligation of exercising effective control over Dar al-Islam. Many parts of Dar al-Islam were under foreign control. And those few which were free and independent have been possessed by a nationalist agitation which prevents one group from accepting the leadership of another, not to speak of permitting it to interfere in its public affairs."<26>

The Committee did not seem to be even vaguely conscious of the fact that the political concept of Dar al-Islam was itself under mortal attack from western secular political thought and was on the verge of passing into oblivion.

What was even more interesting was the fact that parts of the Muslim World that were under foreign occupation should be termed *Dar al-Islam.* By virtue of being under foreign control they no longer formed part of *Dar al-Islam* (because the very definition of *Dar al-Islam* required that it be territory wherein the supreme authority of Allah prevailed over the believers). Secondly, if a single Caliph could not exercise effective control over the rest of the free Muslim World this certainly was not something new in Islam. And it did not prevent the Caliphate from so functioning for more than thirteen hundred years.

In fact the Third Committee should have pointed out that the cities of Makkah and Madina were under Saudi-Wahhabi control and, as a

consequence, any Caliph who was appointed would suffer from the incalculable liability of not having the capacity to exercise control over the *Haramain.* At a time when there was no Caliph and the institution itself was under attack, even more so than in normal times, it was imperative for anyone appointed to the office to control the *Haramain* and, thus, the *Hajj*. And this, in fact, had been the basis of Sharif al-Husain's effort to claim the Caliphate for himself.

The Saudi-Wahhabi ruler who exercised control over the *Haramain* had given ample demonstration of the fact that he was a power to be reckoned with and, in addition, he was not in the least bit interested in the Caliphate. Herein lay the most fundamental predicament of the Caliphate Congress.

What the Committee should have done, and did not do, was to come to the fairly simple conclusion that no Caliph could be appointed and win the recognition of the Muslims so long as the West controlled the *Haramain* and the *Hajj*. And the West would continue to exercise such political control so long as Wahhabis were in control of the *Haramain*. As a consequence, the imperative of the hour was to find the ways and means of counteracting British diplomacy in the peninsular and ousting the Saudi-British control over the *Haramain* and regaining control of the *Haramain* for the *Ummah*.

The Third Committee's report implored the Congress not to be disheartened by the lack of success in solving the problem of the Caliphate and in appointing a new Caliph:

"It is sufficient for the Congress to know that it has rendered an immense service to Muslims in diagnosing for them the disease and indicating to them the remedy."<27>

This remedy was the recommendation that:

". . . the Islamic peoples should organize in concert in several Islamic countries, successive Congresses which will give them the opportunity of periodic exchanges of views until they succeed in solving the question of the Caliphate in conformity with Islamic interests. <28>

Congress Resolutions

The Congress was dismayed by the pessimism of the Third Committee's report. Indeed *Shaikh* al-Zawahiri dubbed it "the funeral oration of Islam". The delegates, who had earlier opened the Congress to the public and the press, now decided that one passage of the report should be withheld from the press. <29> *Shaikh* Zawahiri, who had led the opposition to the Third Committee's report, submitted a draft resolution which was adopted by the Congress. <30> The resolution affirmed that the Caliphate was capable of being realized. Another Congress should be convened in which all the Islamic peoples would be adequately represented and that Congress would take the measures necessary for establishing the Caliphate fulfilling all the conditions prescribed in the *Shari'ah.* In short, such a Congress would elect a new Caliph.

On this optimistic note the Congress ended. The Third Committee, over-ruled by the Congress, found their misgivings eventually vindicated

since the proposed Congress, which was supposed to elect a new Caliph, was never held. The world of Islam was, in fact, entering into the post-caliphate period of its existence. And the basic cause for this was Saudi-Wahhabi rule over the *Hejaz* and the *Haramain*, and the eventual establishment of the Saudi-Wahhabi nation-State of Saudi Arabia as a client State of the godless West.

By the time the dust had settled over the *Al-Azhar* initiative in responding to the abolition of the Ottoman Caliphate it was clear that hostile British and Zionist-Jewish strategy had resulted in a remarkable achievement, to wit: post-caliphate Islam!

CHAPTER FOUR

THE FRAUDULENT SAUDI-WAHHABI ALTERNATIVE TO THE CALIPHATE

The World Muslim Congress Makkah June-July 1926

The World Muslim Congress, which was held in Makkah in July 1926, had its genesis in the impact of the abolition of the Ottoman Caliphate on the Arabian peninsular (jaziratul arab) and, in particular, on the House of Saud which had newly established its rule over Arabia.

Abdul Aziz ibn Saud had recaptured the Nejd after his story-book initial capture of Riyadh in 1902. But in building the political *raison d'etre* for the rule of the House of Saud on the religious foundation of the Wahhabi movement, it was inevitable that a Wahhabi Nejd should challenge the *Hejaz*, whenever the opportunity arose, in order to force the submission of the heart-land of Islam to the (Wahhabi perception of the) true faith.

That opportunity arose when Sharif al-Husain (the Ottoman-appointed Sharif of Makkah), acting in concert with the strategy of the Allied Powers in the first World War, seized the *Hejaz* from the Ottoman Turks in 1916 and imposed over it the rule of the Hashimite House of Husain. In doing so he prohibited the Wahhabis from performing the *Hajj*. Apart from the theological conflicts with the Wahhabis that he used to justify the ban, he

was also conscious of the fact that Wahhabi Nejd constituted the most potent threat to his rule over the *Hejaz*.

Both Husain and Ibn Saud entered into alliances with the British during the war and, as a consequence, Ibn Saud could not attempt to take the *Hejaz* while the war lasted. Even after the conclusion of the war wisdom dictated that he should wait to see what steps the Caliph in Istanbul would take to regain control of the *Hejaz*.

It was only when the Caliphate was abolished that the time had at last come when he could march against Husain. Husain, of course, was well aware of this, and it was in a vain attempt to muster world Muslim support to strengthen his hands against Ibn Saud that he claimed the Caliphate for himself on March 7, 1924 (four days after the abolition of the Ottoman Caliphate).

1924 turned out to be a most eventful year indeed in the history of Islam. For Ibn Saud responded to the announcement of Husain's Caliphate by attacking the *Hejaz*. The Najdi forces of ibn Saud conquered Taif on September 5, 1924, Makkah on October 13, and Madina on December 5. One year later, on December 19, 1925, Jeddah was captured and the luckless `Caliph' and `King of the Arabs' went into exile. Not surprisingly the notables of Makkah found it expedient to proclaim Ibn Saud as King of the *Hejaz*.

Jaziratul arab, which was now united under Saudi-Wahhabi rule, almost immediately began to assert its claim to leadership of the *Ummah* and, in

the process, it provided an alternative route to Muslim unity other than that of the Caliphate, - to wit, the route of `intra-national' Islamic solidarity within a system of sovereign Islamic nation-States.

The Saudi-Wahhabi rulers of the *Hejaz* were well aware that the World of Islam would never have accepted Wahhabi leadership. And hence a Saudi-Wahhabi Caliphate was impossible. On the other hand, if the Muslims of the world got together and appointed a Caliph, that would have been a matter fraught with grave danger indeed for the Saudi-Wahhabi rule over the *Hejaz*. It could have resulted in a repetition of the catastrophic experience of more than a century earlier when the Wahhabis were driven out of the *Hejaz* by an army sent from Egypt.

As a consequence of the impending threat posed by the Caliphate Congress convened in Cairo in May 1926, the Saudis began the search for an alternative political institution and forum to the Caliphate. They found it in the system of Islamic nation-States and international Islamic inter-State cooperation and solidarity. <31> The foundations for the new order had already, and quite conveniently so for the Saudi-Wahhabis, been laid with the establishment, by Mustafa Kamal, of the Republic of Turkey in the very seat of the Caliphate.

It mattered nothing to them that the system of nation-States, which was the political creation of the new secular West, and which constituted the very foundation of the new secular model of society, was in manifest conflict with the Islamic Public Order provisions of the *Shariah*. What was important to them was the fact that the system of Islamic nation-States

would place the Saudi-Wahhabi rule over the *Hejaz* in a virtually impregnable position. The Wahhabi State that had raised the greatest objections to *Bid'ah* (i.e., innovation in religion) was now, itself, proposing the greatest of all *Bid'ah* in the history of the *Ummah!*

The Saudi-Wahhabi strategy was, therefore, to organize a rival Congress to the Caliphate Congress of May 1926. They named their Congress *Mu'tamar al-Alam al-Islami* (World Muslim Congress) and convened it in Makkah in July 1926 on the occasion of the *Hajj*. Because of the mode of transport available in 1926 it would have been very difficult for delegates to attend both Conferences. The Saudis were therefore making a calculated and cunning political initiative that would force the Muslim World to choose to attend one or the other of the two Conferences.

The very purpose of the Saudi sponsored Congress was to lay the classical Islam Public Order to rest, and usher in the new system of Islamic nation-States. Within the framework of the new `intra-national' Islamic Order the Saudi-Wahhabis would seek recognition of their rule over the *Hejaz*.

The *travaux preparatoire* of the Congress reveals, however, that the Saudi leader cunningly projected himself to all the invitees as a `champion' of Islam and he promised to restore authentic Islam to *Jaziratul Arab.*

The Wahhabis, as we noted earlier, were aware that the world of Islam would ever accept a Wahhabi Caliph. But long before this Abdul Wahhab had himself been influenced by the views of that acute thinker of Islam,

Imam ibn Taimiyyah. Their position was that the genuine Caliphate, because it was not rightly constituted, functioned as an instrument for disunity in the *Ummah*. As such, the Caliphate could not be the symbol and the foundation of Muslim unity. This role must be given to the *Shariah.*

It seemed natural, therefore, that the Wahhabi Nejd and *Hejaz* should remain aloof from the Caliphate Congress of Cairo. And because of the strategic position they occupied in respect of their newly-won control over the heart-land of Islam, it was predictable that the Saudi-Wahhabi leadership would seek to seize the opportunity provided by the abolition of the Ottoman Caliphate and the defeat of the short-lived Sharifian Caliphate to lead the *Ummah* along a new approach to unity. <32>

The fact that the date fixed by Ibn Saud for the World Muslim Congress was June-July 1926 (one month after the Cairo Caliphate Congress) was clearly meant to demonstrate that it was being organized as an alternative to the Caliphate Congress.

There was yet another reason for the decision to convene a World Muslim Congress in Makkah. Ibn Saud wanted international Islamic recognition of his authority over the holy land. This was a matter of vital importance to the Wahhabis since there were significant religious differences between them and the rest of the world of Islam. Not least of these was the fact that the Wahhabis followed the Hanbali school of Islamic law and were a tiny minority in a world of Islam dominated by followers of the Hanafi, Shafei and Maliki schools of law. <33>

When, in the 18th century, the Wahhabis won a short-lived control over the holy land they perpetrated, in their fanatical zeal, a tremendous blood-bath. There was wide-spread anger and revulsion in the world of Islam and an Egyptian army that was sent to the *Hejaz* defeated them and drove them out into the wilderness. The second time around, therefore, the Wahhabis wanted to ensure that the world of Islam would recognize their rule over the holy land. <34> This was the second primary objective for which the World Muslim Congress was convened.

The Delegates to the Congress

The World Muslim Congress that convened in Makkah in June 1926 as a result of the efforts of Ibn Saud, was hailed as the first such meeting in the history of Islam. Ibn Saud himself referred to this in his opening address:

"In respect of its form and its objective, your meeting is without doubt the first of its kind in the annals of Islam." <35>

From the very beginning it was intended to be a permanent organization:

"We pray to the Almighty that this Congress may meet again and again each year (at the time of the Hajj)." <36>

Unlike the Caliphate Congress of Cairo, the Makkah Conference attracted both a representative gathering and a high quality of representation. All the important Islamic communities and all the independent Islamic States

(except Persia) were represented. From the South Asian sub-continent came top-level representation of all the important Islamic organizations. For example, Sayyed Sulaiman Nadvi headed the delegation representing the Caliphate Movement of India. <37> The other three members of the delegation were *Maulana* Muhammad Ali Jauhar, his brother, *Maulana* Shaukat Ali, and his son-in-law, Shoaib Quraishi. There was a delegation headed by Sayyed Muhammad Kifayatullah representing the Association of *ulama* of India and another delegation headed by *Shaikh* Sanaullah representing the *Ulama Ahl al-Hadith* of India.

The Grand Mufti of Palestine, Sayyed Amin al-Husseini, headed the Palestinian delegation, General Ghulam Jilani Khan, - the Afghan delegation, Edib Saroit, - the Turkish delegation, *Shaikh* al-Zawahiri, - the Egyptian delegation and Reazuddin Fakhruddin, - the delegation of Russian Muslims. With Fakhruddin on that delegation were delegates from Oufa, Astrakan, Kazan, Crimea, Siberia and Turkistan. Delegates also came from Java, Syria, Sudan, Najd, *Hejaz*, Yemen, etc.

A number of individuals were specially invited to the Congress. In this group were *Shaikh* Rashid Rida the famous Syrian Islamic scholar who was a student of *Shaikh* Muhammad Abdu, and Sardar Iqbal Ali Shah, the London-based Afghan scholar, who wrote a series of articles on the Conference for British publications. <38> The significant absentees from the Conference were Persia, China, the Sanusi of Libya and the rest of the Maghrib.

The composition of the Cairo and the Makkah Conferences differed in another important respect. Whereas in Cairo no delegation was recognized as being official and all delegates participated in their individual capacities, this was not so at Makkah. To this latter conference the Islamic countries and communities sent official delegations and, in so doing, demonstrated a preference for the Makkah forum and for the new approach to unity. And herein lies a simple yet fundamental explanation for the organization of the contemporary world of Islam as a system of nation-States, to wit: the Muslim masses uncritically opted for it because of two reasons:

- because of the dismal objective situation then facing the Muslim World,
- because the *ulama* could not effectively articulate the foundations of the Islamic Public Order (Dar al-Islam) and the Islamic Conception of an International Order within which Dar al-Islam was located.

The King and the Congress

The Congress received two messages from King Abdul Aziz ibn Saud. In the first, the opening address of the Congress, the King made reference to the sorry history of the *Hejaz* ending with the despotism of Husain who, among his other sins, placed the *Hejaz* under "foreign non-Muslim influence". <39> This being prohibited by the Prophet , a justification was therefore presented for the Najdi conquest of the *Hejaz*. As a result of that conquest, the King was pleased to point out, there was now security in the *Hejaz*. The Congress was invited to hold its sessions in that atmosphere of security and of total liberty. The only constraints on the conference were the restraints of the Islamic Law and of "not meddling in international

politics nor in the differences which separate certain Muslim peoples from their governments." <40> And yet Ibn Saud was less than honest in his opening statement since he was just as guilty as was Husain in aiding and abetting the penetration of British influence in the peninsular.

Two things stand out in the King's address. Firstly the Wahhabi leadership was showing its best possible face in order to court the support of the Congress, - thus the `security' and `total liberty' promised. But secondly, and more important, the ban on international politics in the discussions of the Congress clearly implied that the security of the Saudi-Wahhabi State and the maintenance of its relations with its allies (Britain in particular) took precedence over the considered opinions of the *Ummah* even when expressed through shura in an Islamic Conference 'unprecedented' in the history of Islam.

The King gave to the Congress the `safe' task of "examining the necessary ways and means for making the holy places the best centers of Islamic culture and education, the most perfect region in terms of prosperity and hygiene, and the Muslim country which is most conspicuous for its recognition of Islam." <41>

It was very clear from this address that the King was attempting to foist on the Congress an artificial division between `religion` and `politics', and a new theory to the effect that the proper subject matter for the consideration of Islamic Congresses was the subject matter of `religion' and `religious affairs'. And this was a bid'ah of a truly reprehensible nature since it was in such manifest conflict with the Qur'anic guidance, the *Sunnah* of the

Prophet and the very foundations of the Islamic legacy. The King was, in fact, making an attempt to transform *al-Islam*, which was *al-Din*, into `religion' in the narrow and distorted sense in which the term was used in secular western civilization.

On July 2nd., 1926, on the occasion of the 15th plenary session, the King addressed a second message to the Congress, through which he sought to achieve one of the main objectives of the Wahhabi initiative, to wit, the international Islamic recognition and acceptance of Saudi-Wahhabi control over the *Hejaz*.

The King expounded his *politique* for the *Hejaz* as follows:

1. "We do not admit any foreign intervention in this sacred country - whatever may be its nature.

2. "We do not admit any privileges open to some and denied to others; whatever takes place in this country must conform with the Shariah.

3. "The Hejaz must have a special neutral regime. It must neither make war nor be attacked; and all the independent Muslim States must guarantee this neutrality.

4. "There is need for examining the question of financial aid which comes (to the Hejaz) from many Islamic countries, the manner of distribution and the (need to ensure the) benefit to the holy places." <42>

What the King was attempting to do in this address was nothing less than propounding a new Islamic political theory. It was as though the

Saudi-Wahhabis were convinced that they were the only Muslims, and hence *Hejaz* and Najd, which were under their control, was the real Dar al-Islam. Thus all territories outside of *Hejaz* and Najd (or modern Saudi Arabia) were `foreign'. And when the King spoke about the need to prevent any `foreign' intervention in the *Hejaz*, he was referring specifically to the kind of intervention that had ousted the Wahhabis from the *Hejaz* more than a century earlier. In referring to the whole of the world of Islam as `foreign', the King was quite close to committing an act of *Kufr*.

The second point made was, of course, quite admirable i.e., a non-discriminatory application of the injunctions of the *Shariah*. But the second point was incompatible with the first. The world of Islam was being accorded the status of `foreigners' who, naturally, would not be eligible to all the privileges open to the Saudi-Wahhabis. Foreigners, for example, would need a visa in order to enter the *Hejaz* even for performing the *Hajj*. The Saudi-Wahhabis would not require a visa since they were citizens of the new-born State of Saudi Arabia and so the *Hejaz* belonged to them. Non-Saudi Muslims could now be imprisoned if they extended their stay in *Hejaz* after the expiry of their visas, - for they were now foreigners and the *Hejaz*, which was no longer Dar al-Islam, did not belong to them. Saudi-Wahhabis could stay in the *Hejaz* as long as they wished since the *Hejaz* now belonged to them.

The King had, in fact, dismantled the *Dar al-Islam* which had been established by the Prophet himself, and by his companions, in the *Hejaz*, had dispossessed the world of Islam of its very heartland, had insulted the

Muslims, and was destined to get away with that audacious behavior for more than six decades.

The third point made in the King's address was quite remarkable. There could be no doubt at all that it was a manifest statement of bid'ah. Neither in the Qur'an, nor in the *Sunnah* of the Prophet, nor in the entire Islamic legacy is there any concept of the `neutrality' of the *Hejaz*. Indeed the statement that the *Hejaz* must not make war amounted to taking the very heartland of Islam out of jihad, and was thus in manifest conflict with explicit commands of the Qur'an. Here again the King was walking the path of *Kufr*.

In respect of the request of the King that all independent Islamic States should recognize the `neutrality' of his regime, it was clear that this was a scarcely disguised attempt to win recognition from the world of Islam of Saudi-Wahhabi rule over the *Hejaz*.

The conference responded to the address of the King by making free but intelligent use of the freedom that the King offered. Delegates spoke freely and candidly and, as a perusal of the Verbatim Report of the conference reveals, nothing appears to have been `stage-managed' by the regime. Indeed, on occasions the delegates of the *Hejaz* found themselves outvoted.<43>

By and large, the conference stayed within the limitations imposed on it of not meddling in international politics. As such the Caliphate question was never discussed. This was a major triumph for the new approach to

Muslim unity. The conference did, however, enter into politics in approving a resolution <44> demanding the return of Maan and Aqaba to *Hejaz*i control since the British annexation of these territories to Transjordan (over which Britain was the mandate power) violated what Rashid Rida claimed to be the command of the Prophet that the Arabian peninsular must remain free of all non-Islamic influence. <45>

When Ibn Saud himself brought international politics into the Congress with the exposition of his *politique* for the *Hejaz*, the Congress debated the issue at length and then displayed its wisdom, integrity and faithfulness to authentic Islam by denying the King the recognition he was seeking. The Congress decided to simply `note' the statement of the King. And this was, perhaps, the single most important decision taken by a representative body of the *Ummah* over the last sixty years.

It was a bitter blow indeed for Ibn Saud and the result was that the Congress remained dormant for the next twenty years and was never again to meet in Makkah where, it was agreed, it would be meeting annually at the time of the *Hajj*.

On another volatile issue, however, the Congress found it prudent to yield to the wishes of their host. Ibn Saud had drawn to the attention of the Congress, in his capacity as one of the Muslim Heads of State, that although all Muslims were free to worship in the Holy Land according to the rights of their respective legal schools, the Wahhabi administration would not tolerate any behavior that was in conflict with the *Shariah*. This issue provoked one of the most heated discussions in the Congress.

Shaikh al-Zawahiri saved the day by presenting a compromise draft resolution that confined itself to demanding freedom of rites but did not enter into the controversial area of the repair of tombs of companions of the Prophet that had been destroyed by the Wahhabis, etc.

The issue had struck at the heart of Wahhabis and although it had not been allowed to develop into a crisis, the delegates exercising the greatest prudence in not pressing Ibn Saud too hard, all the same the Indian delegates left with bitter feelings. This, in part, explains why the Congress did not meet again in Makkah, as had been agreed upon.

In fact it was the Indian Muslim leader, *Maulana* Shaukat Ali, who played the leading role in organizing the third major Islamic conference, in 1931, after the two conferences in 1926. And he had no hesitation whatsoever and bypassing Makkah and agreeing upon Jerusalem as its venue.

Some of the most beneficial work of the Makkah Congress concerned the improvement of conditions for the *Hajj*, transportation (in particular the *Hejaz* railway), medical facilities, availability of food and water, protection from exploitation, etc. These were matters that affected pilgrims every year and on these matters the Congress deliberated at length and adopted many useful resolutions.

CHAPTER FIVE

THE OLD WORLD OF ISLAM - A LAST ATTEMPT AT REVIVAL

The General Islamic Congress Jerusalem December 1931

For five long years after the two conferences of 1926 no other significant collective attempt was made by the world of Islam to respond to the collapse of the Caliphate and to other momentous, challenging and dangerous changes which were sweeping that world. The final last gasp of the dying *Dar al-Islam* occurred at the General Islamic Congress that was held in Jerusalem in December l93l, on the basis of an Indo-Palestinian effort. <46> It did have within its bosom the cherished desire of restoring some semblance of integrity to the collapsing old order left by the Prophet. But it failed to achieve anything. Like the Cairo and Makkah Congresses it appeared to have been still-born.

To the Grand Mufti of Jerusalem, *Hajj* Amin al-Hussaini, the ominous advances of Zionism in Muslim Palestine between 1926 and 1931 presented a threat to Islam. This threat could not be met except by the united world of Islam. And it was a measure of the simplicity, naivete and innocence of the contemporary Islamic thought that he could argue that another Islamic conference to be held in British-occupied Jerusalem would be the appropriate way to meet the threat. Salahuddin Ayyubi must have rolled in his grave. It appeared as though the world of Islamic scholarship

had lost sight of the firm relationship that the Qur'an had established between `power', `freedom' and `faith'.

In August 1929 there were riots between Muslims and Jews over the Wailing Wall in Jerusalem. The League of Nations sent a Commission to investigate the matter and the Commission's findings were that Muslims possessed `property rights' over the Wailing Wall but that Jews possessed the `right to worship' before it. This report pleased neither Muslims nor Jews and could be said to have led indirectly to the call for an Islamic conference.

In early 1931, on the occasion of the burial within the precincts of the *Haram al-Sharif,* Jerusalem, of the Indian Muslim leader *Maulana* Muhammad Ali Jawhar <47>, agreement was reached between his brother, *Maulana* Shaukat Ali, and *Hajj* Amin al Hussaini on the need to convene a conference. A few months later, in June 1931, the report of the Wailing Wall Commission was made public, and the Supreme Muslim Council of Palestine then made the public call for the conference.

The formal announcement on agreement to convene the conference and the decision on the date for the conference was made on September 4, 1931, by *Maulana* Shaukat Ali, in an address after the midday prayer in Masjid al-Aqsa, Jerusalem. The Indian Muslims can now be said to have attained a position of unique and extraordinary importance and leadership in the world of Islam.

The Date and Venue

The General Islamic Congress was held in Jerusalem from 6th. to 16th. December 1931. This corresponds to 27th. Rajab - 7th. Shaban in the Islamic Calendar. We may note in passing that the reference to the Islamic calendar is significant as was the choice of the Masjid al-Aqsa as the venue for the opening session of the Congress on 27th. Rajab. <48>

Now whereas the Caliphate Congress took place in a nominally independent Egypt which was within the British sphere of influence, and the World Muslim Congress was convened in a nominally independent *Hejaz* which was also firmly within the British sphere of influence, the Aqsa Islamic Congress was to take place in territory which was under direct British mandate rule. Jerusalem did not have as much as a `fig leaf' to cover its status as occupied territory. Some would even argue that occupied territory would have the status of Dar al-Harb!

It must have been a most extraordinary spectacle indeed for the world of Islam to gather in a World Islamic Congress within occupied territory to seek to restore the Public Law dimension of the *Shariah*. In this respect the General Islamic Congress of Jerusalem was unique and unprecedented in the entire history of Islam. In fact, this revealed the pathetic state to which the world of Islam had been reduced. The British Government was probably most surprised of all with this development. In so far as the British were concerned the world of Islam would be putting its impotence on public display. A gleeful British Government simply restricted itself to having its High Commissioner warn *Hajj* Amin al-Husaini that the Government would not allow the convening of a Congress at which

questions might be raised affecting the internal and external affairs of friendly powers. <49>

The Zionist press, on the other hand, reacted with great apprehension to the call for the Congress, accusing the British Government of allowing the Congress because “she really wanted the conference, nay, she provoked it in order to satisfy the Muslims of Palestine and India and to counteract the Zionist Movement.” <50>

One also had to take into consideration the very strong feeling voiced by many that the Congress would attempt to re-instate Abdul Majeed as Caliph with his seat in Jerusalem. Such a move could have a destabilizing effect on the Angora (now Ankara) regime, - and a Caliph in Jerusalem, subject to British authority, would also be something which Great Britain would welcome and could exploit to tremendous advantage. <51>

Delegates

The Congress did take place in an atmosphere fairly free of restrictions, and apart from the expulsion of the Egyptian, Abd al-Rahman Azzam, on account of his severe criticism of Italian policy in Libya, the British authorities in Palestine did not interfere in any way with the Congress nor did they place any restrictions on attendance.

Delegates to the Congress came from Persia (some shia *ulama*), India (among whose delegates was the great Muslim scholar and thinker, Dr. Muhammad Iqbal), Yugoslavia, Morocco, Algeria, Tunisia, Libya, Syria

and Nigeria. Although the Egyptian Government finally decided not to send any official delegation, there were Egyptian delegates present to support the King. They were opposed by a delegation representing the *Wafd* party of Egypt. A number of other Islamic movements in Egypt were also represented.

The Governments of Iraq and Transjordan sent official delegations. The Saudi monarch, Abdul Aziz ibn-Saud, vacillated in his attitude towards the Congress and finally and cleverly sent a representative who was unable to reach Jerusalem in time to participate in the Congress. Turkey and Afghanistan declined to take part in the Congress. Compared, therefore, with the Makkah Congress of July 1926, there was a sharp drop in the participation of official governmental delegations at the Jerusalem Congress.

The Work of the Congress

After the formal opening of the Congress in the masjid al-Aqsa after the sunset prayers on December 6 (27th Rajab), <52> eight committees were formed to study and report on the following matters:

- The Statute of the Congress
- Congress propaganda and publications
- Finance and organization
- Muslim culture and the proposed Islamic University of al-Aqsa
- The *Hejaz* railway
- The Holy Places and the Wailing Wall
- Islamic propaganda and guidance

- Proposals laid before the Congress.

Like the Makkah Congress of 1926, the Jerusalem Congress adopted a Statute or Charter. The Makkah Statute had called for annual meetings in Makkah. The Jerusalem Statute called for biannual meetings in Jerusalem. A small secretariat was also established in Jerusalem (as was done in Makkah). The Jerusalem Secretariat continued to function for a few years but the Congress itself never met again. <53>

The Congress decided that an Islamic University should be built in Jerusalem. The decision was taken despite the considerable jealousy aroused from al-Azhar University which did not welcome the creation of a competitor to its unique position in the world of Islamic learning. <54>

But the most important matter that engaged the attention of the Congress was, without doubt, the Zionist threat in Palestine. The attitude and approach of the Conference to the volatile subject was remarkably broad-minded and objective. The President of the Jewish Agency, Mr. Sokolow, was invited to attend the Congress for the purpose of explaining the Zionist point of view. The invitation, extended by Shaukat Ali, was refused. And in the Zionist press militant Zionism mocked and ridiculed the Congress. <55>

There was another section of Zionists, more peaceful than the first group, who had set up the Hebrew University. These Zionists spoke with more dignity about the Congress although they, too, criticized Britain just as

strongly as the other Zionists for having permitted the Congress to discuss British policy in Palestine. <56>

But the old orthodox Jews in Jerusalem, who lived and worked quite apart from the Zionists, greeted the Congress at the beginning and wished it all success. They stated that the Jews did not want the holy places and had no right to them; but they entreated the Congress not to oppose the old Jewish custom of praying at the Wailing Wall. <57>

The Congress did just that! It rejected the League of Nation's Wailing Wall Commission's report which confirmed Muslim ownership of the Wailing Wall but upheld the right of the Jews to pray at the Wall. <58> In so doing the Congress alienated the orthodox Jews and weakened their hands (i.e. the orthodox Jews) in their struggle again the Zionists. <59>

The Congress protested to the League of Nations the encroachment of rights and reminded the League of the assistance given by the Arabs to the Allies in the first World War. The Congress warned that `mandate' did not mean the subjugation of the Arabs and the usurpation of their rights. The Congress did not reject the principle of Jewish immigration into Palestine and the purchasing of land and property. Implicitly, therefore, the Congress recognized the right of Jews to enter and to live in Palestine and to own property there. In the context, however, of the Zionist plan of establishing a Jewish National Home in Palestine, the Congress responded by proposing the establishment of an Agricultural Bank that would render financial support for landed peasants and agriculturists in order to strengthen the resistance to the Zionist efforts to buy their land.

The response of the Congress to the Zionist threat may be considered to have been moderate. This contrasted sharply to the Arab nationalist response. Indeed the Congress resisted the pressure of the Arab nationalists to adopt a more militant position. The Arab nationalists met separately during the Congress and formulated an 'Arab Covenant' which was a predictable response to Jewish nationalism.<60> The one, indeed, was the counterpart of the other. <61>

The Congress failed to perceive, however, that the Islamic religious response should have included an active strategy to build a common religious front with those Jews who opposed Zionism and who were friendly towards the Muslims. <62> Although the Qur'an did prohibit the establishment of such relations with Jews (and other non-Muslims) as would place the Muslims in a state of dependence or subservience, it did not prohibit an alliance or common front free from dependence. <63>

What was particularly disappointing was the failure of the Congress, sitting right there in the holy city of Jerusalem, to make a realistic appraisal of the very bleak objective situation then facing the world of Islam, and to courageously and creatively formulate a coherent and intelligent long-term strategy for restoring power to the *Ummah*.

In the midst of all the excited and heated political discussions of the Congress, one voice stood out as the voice of the statesman and the sage. Dr. Muhammad Iqbal had the vision to warn that the worst dangers facing Islam were not the nefarious designs of Zionism, the greed of the imperial

powers, and so on, but atheistic materialism and territorial patriotism. Unless these were resisted, decay in Islam would set in. <64>

But while it was true that Iqbal had the vision of the great philosophical dangers, such as materialism, looming ahead of Islamic civilization, it would appear that he was as yet incapable of theoretically reformulating the Islamic Public Order (or Dar al-Islam) and Islam's Conception of an International Order and then articulating it in such a way as would convincingly demonstrate its superiority over the secular rival which was now challenging it. The truth of the matter is that Iqbal did not know what were the steps that should have been taken in 1931 to restore power to the *Ummah!*

Post Congress Activities

The Congress elected an Executive Committee <65> which functioned diligently for one year. Branches of the Organization were formed in different countries and representatives of these branches met in Jerusalem in August 1932 to discuss ways and means for the collection of funds. In 1933 Amin al-Hussaini and Altabah Pasha went on a tour of Iraq and India in order to collect funds. They did not succeed and so neither the University nor the Agricultural Bank (to help the peasants) were established.

The second meeting of the Congress that, according to the Statute, should have taken place in November 1933, did not take place. Except for a sudden spur of activity by the Executive Committee in `conflict-mediation'

in 1934 <66> and a short-lived revival in the fifties, the General Islamic Congress of Jerusalem also died a natural death.

The Secretariat established by the Congress in 1931 continued to function in Jerusalem until the second World War. It could not, however, survive the adverse wartime conditions and the direct confrontation between *Hajj* Amin and the British. *Hajj* Amin fled to Egypt at the beginning of the war.

The General Islamic Congress of Jerusalem of 1931 failed for the same reasons as the Caliphate Congress and the World Muslim Congress of 1926. It was unable to theoretically articulate a way out of the morass in which the world of Islam had fallen. It was intellectually incapable of responding to the challenge of the political secularism of an arrogant and confident western civilization that was foisting on an intellectually stagnant World of Islam a system of secular nation-States to replace *Dar al-Islam.*

The demise of the Caliphate witnessed the end of a system of political organization that was indigenous to the *Ummah*, and which recognized the supremacy of Islam in public life. The emergence of the secular Saudi-Wahhabi nation-State in the very heart-land of Islam meant that Islam was now going to be secularized. It would now be relegated to being a matter of private life. The non-political *Tableeg Jamaat* and the pro-regime Saudi *Salafis* would now attempt fill the void. And Abdullah Yusuf Ali's `politically correct' translation of the Qur'an would be popularized amongst an unsuspecting generation of politically dormant Muslims. <67>

CONCLUSION

The destruction of the Caliphate of Islam was the result of a diabolical conspiracy hatched by the British, the Zionist Jews. The Saudis acted as willing accomplices to that crime against the *Ummah*. The Caliphate symbolized a system of political organization (i.e., *Dar al-Islam*) that recognized the supremacy of Islam in public life and in the international relations of the Muslim world.

The emergence of the secular nation-states of Turkey and Saudi Arabia at the seat of the Caliphate and in the very heart-land of Islam, paved the way for the secularization of the system of political organization of the Muslim world. And since it was governments of secular nation-States within the Muslim world that would now represent the World of Islam, the implication was that Islam would no longer be supreme over public life or over the international relations of the Muslim world.

A more blunt way of saying the same thing would be to say that in so far as public life in the Muslim world was concerned, Allah would no longer be *Akbar!* No Muslim can read these lines without feeling great anger against those who betrayed Allah and the Prophet! The quality of faith (Iman) of a Muslim can be gauged through the manner in which he responds to this pathetic situation.

The World of Islam is today without power. Our conclusion is that the institution of the Caliphate, which forms part of *Dar al-Islam*, is indispensable for the restoration of power. Without power there will be

many more Bosnias, Kashmirs, Algerias, Chechnyas, Palestines etc. The only way this deplorable state of affairs can be changed is through the restoration of the supremacy of Islam in the public life of Muslims and in the international relations of the Muslim world. That requires the restoration of *Dar al-Islam* and the Caliphate. We need, therefore, to articulate anew the provisions of the Islamic Public Order (*Dar al-Islam*) and Islam's Conception of an International Order, and to demonstrate their clear superiority over the secular rival which has emerged from western civilization.

We also need to recognize, as this booklet has made clear, that it is impossible, and will remain impossible, to restore the Caliphate so long as the *Hejaz* remains under the control of the Saudi-Wahhabi alliance. Power cannot be restored without the liberation of the *Haramain* and the *Hajj* from the control of those who participated in the destruction of the Caliphate.

The liberation of the *Haramain* and the *Hajj* will be possible when the Saudi-Wahhabi alliance breaks down. There are indications that alliance is under great pressure and can fall apart. There are many Saudi *Ulama* who now imprisoned or under house arrest. The issue which is most likely to tear the alliance apart would be Saudi `recognition' of the Jewish State of Israel, - hence the importance of our recent work entitled: `The Religion of Abraham and the State of Israel', in which we analyze, from a purely Islamic religious perspective, the implications for Muslims of the `recognition' of the Jewish State of Israel.

END

Notes

1. Elie Kedourie, in a chapter entitled `The Fall of Madina - January 1919' (Islam in the Modern World, Holt Rinehart and Winston, NY. 1980 pp 277-96) provides a vivid description and excellent analysis of the heroic defense of Madina by the Ottoman Commander, Fakhri Pasha, until January 1919 when he was betrayed by some of his troops.

2. Ahl al-Dhimmah are a protected non-Muslim people permitted to reside in Dar al-Islam. Jizyah is a punitive tax imposed by the Qur'an upon a people who were defeated in Jihad, and who wish to continue to reside in their former territory. Payment of the punitive tax is meant to symbolize their submission to the rule of Islam in that territory.

3. "Oh you who believe (in the Qur'an), do not take Jews and Christians as your protecting friends (i.e., do not enter into a relationship of alliance and dependence with Jews and Christians in which you depend upon them for your security), Qur'an (5:51)

4. Toynbee Ed., Survey of International Affairs, 1925.

5. Cf. Bey, Rustom: "The Future of Islamism", The 19th Century and After, Vol.xcxii, No 580 June 1925, pp 845-54, where the liberal Turkish thinker argues the point in a well-reasoned article.

6. For an interesting discussion on the subject see Toynbee, Ed. Survey of International Affairs, 1925, Vol 1 pp 51-68, especially p 55. See also concluding chapter of Sylvia Haim in Arnold, T. The Caliphate. Revised Ed, Oxford Univ. Press, 1965 pp 205-44.

7. Official Turkish Text in Qawanin Majmuasi 1924/1340, No 431, Ankara. Press of the Grand National Assembly of Turkey. English translation in Survey , Op cit, Appendix 11 (3) p 575.

8. "According to Sunni Law the appointment of an Imam or Caliph is absolutely indispensable . . . Turkey`s ijtihad is that according to the spirit of Islam the Caliphate or Imamate can be vested in a body of persons, or an elected Assembly (e.g., the Turkish Grand National Assembly or Parliament). Personally I believe the Turkish view is perfectly sound." Iqbal, M. The Reconstruction of Religious Thought in Islam. Oxford University Press. London. 1934 Chap. vi "The Principle of Movement in the Structure of Islam", p. 149

9 This group was supposed to constitute a virtual electoral college in the classical model of Islam. Throughout Islamic history, however, it almost always remained a mere theoretical construction and played no role in the supreme decision-making process.

10 This declaration is very significant in the context of present-day efforts to re-establish an authentic Islamic Order. It depicts glaring defects in the understanding of the Islamic system of leadership by that supreme center of Islamic learning. Full text Survey, Op. cit., Appendix 111, pp 576-8.

11 So novel, indeed, was the proposal that it was denounced by the Chief Qadi of Transjordan as an innovation which was contrary to orthodox religious practice. Survey, Op. cit., p 84.

12 "When the Great National Assembly of Angora (Ankara) abolished the Ottoman Caliphate and when the Wahhabis drove the Hashimi dynasty out of the *Hejaz*, the general impulse in Islam was to deal with the situation by the modern Western method

of convening an international conference and not by the traditional Islamic method of preaching a Holy War." Survey, Op. cit., p 24.

13 Sylvia Haim claims that there was enough evidence to prove that the Congress was planned and encouraged through the instigation of King Fuad who was secretly hoping to gain the Caliphate for himself. But this was not feasible because of opposition in and out of Egypt. Cf Arnold, Op. cit.. pp 241-2. While this may be true, the public position of Fuad was disinterest in the Caliphate. Sa'ad Zaghlul, his Prime Minister, maintained a studied neutrality on the subject.

14 The Verbatim Record of the conference was translated into French and published by A. Sekaly in Revue du Monde Musulman, Vol 1 xiv, Paris,1926. It is this text which is being used by the writer.

15 In addition to pointing out that the Caliph was needed to "execute judgments, apply legal sanctions, close the ports, raise the armies etc.", the Committee considered it sufficiently important to quote two Hadith (Sayings of the Prophet) to the effect that:

"Whoever dies without having known the Caliph of his time dies a pagan death; and "Whoever dies without having taken the baiy'ah (oath of allegiance to the Caliph or Amir) dies a pagan death." Revue, Op. cit., pp 74-6

16 Ibid. pp 75-6. In doing so, the Committee disregarded the views of the Mu'tazilites who regarded the Caliphate as a matter of expediency, and the Khawarij who adopted the position that there was no need for the Caliphate. The Committee also chose to disregard the view expressed by *Shaikh* Ali 'Abd al-Raziq, a graduate of *Al-Azhar*, who argued, in a paper which was published in Egypt, that the Caliphate was not a necessity in Islam. His views created quite a stir in Egypt.

17 Revue, Op. cit., pp 76-7

18 He became the Rector of *Al-Azhar* in 1929

19 Revue, Op. cit., pp 77-8

20 (Qur'an 5:48)

21 Reference is being made to such authorities as al-Mawardi (al-Ahkam al-Sultaniyyah), al-Ghazzali (Ihya uloom al-Din.) For a detailed exposition of the views of the *ulama* see Arnold, T. Op. cit..

22 The fifth Caliph, Muawiyah, appointed his son, Yazid, as his successor and was succeeded by him. The grandson of the Prophet, Husain, challenged the legitimacy of Yazid's Caliphate and paid for it with his life. Not many Muslims cared to follow Husain's example in the centuries which followed.

23 Revue, Op. cit.. p 103

24 Ibid. p 108. The text of the report of the Third Committee is to be found in Survey, Op. cit.. Appendix 4, pp 578-81

25 Ibid.. p 106

26 Revue, Op cit, p 106

27 Revue, Op. cit., p 106

28 Ibid.. p 107

29 The paragraph is to be found in Revue, Op. cit., p 108, "De ce qui procede . . ." , and in the Survey, Op. cit., p 580, "It follows from the above . . ."

30 Text of the Resolution in Revue, Op. cit., p 118; Survey, Op. cit, pp 89-90

31 Cf. Faruki, Kamal: "Approaches to Muslim Unity". Pakistan Horizon. Vol xxv, No 2, pp 3-12 in which he describes this alternative to the Caliphate, or to Pan-Islamism, as Islamic universalism - which relies for unity on the common beliefs and practices of Muslims. Faruqi ignores, however, the quite transparent fact that the Caliphate was founded upon and derived its legitimacy from the very beliefs and practices of the Muslims.

32 Faruki, Op. cit., pp 3-12

33 Sunnis recognized all four schools as equally valid.

34 Until the Iranian Islamic Revolution the Saudi-Wahhabis had succeeded in winning this recognition from all the governments of the Islamic nation-States. Among the Muslim masses, however, considerable resentment still exists.

35 Revue, Op. cit.. p.128

36 Ibid.

37 It was paradoxical that the Caliphate Movement of India should boycott the Caliphate Congress of Cairo in May and attend the World Muslim Congress of Makkah in June from the agenda of which the question of the caliphate was specifically excluded.

38 Those articles would make very interesting reading if published today.

39 A reference to Husain's ties with the British.

40 Revue, Op. cit.. pp. l28-l3l.

41 Revue, Op. cit.. pp 128-31

42 Revue, Op. cit..

43 For example, the conference approved the project of building two railway lines from Jeddah to Makkah and from Yanbu to Madina despite the strong opposition of the *Hejaz*i delegates "who had religious objections to the construction of railways in a country in which life depends on the camel."
Revue, Op. cit.. p.193. How one wished that the Saudi *ulama* could have articulated their objections to the railway in the context of it constituting a substitute which would displace the mode of transport which Allah had created. The Saudi authorities would then have become conscious of the danger which modern technology posed and would have made provision to preserve natural transport alongside mechanized transport.

44 Text of the resolution in Revue, Op. cit.. pp 207-8. Egypt, Turkey and Afghanistan abstained in the vote.

45 According to Toynbee:
" . . . one of the effects of the war of 1914-18 was to eliminate the Turks from Arabia and to extend the British sphere of influence over the whole peninsula (Survey, Op. cit.. p 272)

But it is very important to note that in this unique and momentous achievement of the British in which the command of the Prophet was compromised for the first time in thirteen hundred years, the British were aided and abetted by both Husain and Ibn Saud. Indeed both commanded a price for their services to Britain. The Arab forces of Husain

actually fought alongside the British against the Turks. Ibn Saud's benevolent neutrality in this struggle enhanced the chances of Britain's success. Up to 1920 when his monthly payments from the British were stopped, Husain had received about six million pounds sterling. Ibn Saud, who received from the same British Government a more modest 350,000 pounds at the rate of 5000 pounds a month, diabolically explained it away as jizyah (a tax paid by a subject non-Muslim people resident in the territory of Dar al-Islam)". Survey, Op. cit.. p.273.

It was Britain (the mandate power in Transjordan) which had annexed Maan and Aqaba to Transjordan in 1925. Although ex-King Husain protested the annexation rom his exile in Cyprus and Ibn Saud moved the World Muslim Congress to adopt a resolution protesting the annexation, the British action was clearly a fait accompli.

It is interesting to note that if the command of the Prophet *(sallalahu 'alahi wa sallam)* had not been compromised by Husain and Ibn Saud in their misguided assistance to the British and in the attempt to rid the peninsular of Ottoman influence, it would not have been possible for the Balfour Declaration to be fulfilled and for the Zionist State to be established in Muslim Palestine. It is also interesting to note that if Aqaba had remained under *Hejaz*i control, Saudi Arabia would have been a front-line State in the present Middle East conflict. History may one day reveal that one of the reasons for the British annexation of Ma'an and Aqaba was to create a buffer zone between the volatile heartland of Islam and the Jewish national home in Palestine which the Balfour Declaration envisaged. It should be clear that a direct confrontation between the *Hejaz* (now part of Saudi Arabia) and the Jewish National Home in Palestine (now the State of Israel) would arouse uncontrollable Islamic passions, a factor which still constitutes the only serious threat to the survival of the Zionist State.

46 It is wrong to assert (as the World Muslim Congress of Karachi now does) that the Islamic conference held in Jerusalem in 1931 was the second session of the World Muslim Congress (the first being held in Makkah in 1926). Firstly the Jerusalem Congress chose a name for itself different from `World Muslim Congress'. Article One

of the Statute of the Congress named it as `General Islamic Congress' (al-Mu'tamar al-Islami al-'Am). Secondly, the Congress adopted a Statute of its own - different from the Statute of the World Muslim Congress.

47 Muhammad Ali Jauhar had actually died in London where he was participating in the Round Table Conference on India. The Palestinians moved for him to be buried in the haram al-sharif partly out of recognition of his greatness and partly to win greater Indian support in the struggle against Zionism and the British `Mandate' power.

48 There is an important link between 27th Rajab, al-Aqsa Mosque and the Wailing Wall, a link which moves emotions very powerfully in the world of Islam. The explanation is as follows: The seventeenth chapter of the Qur'an, entitled `Bani Israel', commences with a verse which refers to the miraculous night-journey of the Prophet Muhammad from the masjid al-Haram (the sacred mosque, Makkah) to the masjid al-Aqsa (the distant mosque, Jerusalem) the precincts of which, according to the verse, have been blessed by Allah took him on the journey so that He could show him some of His `Signs'.

The Hadith literature states that upon arrival in al-Aqsa he led a congregational prayer in which all the Prophets participated. Subsequently he was transported into the heavens and was honored with an experience of entry into the special presence of Allah. The Wailing Wall or Western Wall forms a part of the haram al-Sharif which houses masjid al-Aqsa as well as the spot from which the Prophet's heavenly journey commenced. It is generally believed that this journey took place on 27th Rajab. (Mishkat al-Masabih), English translation by James Robson, Lahore, Sh. Muhammad Ashraf, 1975, vol.2, Ch. 23, Book 26 pp. 1264-70.

49 Gibb, H.A.R., "The Islamic Conference in Jerusalem in December 1931." Survey of International Affairs, London, Oxford University Press, 1935. p. 103.

50 Nielsen, A. "The Islamic Conference at Jerusalem." The Muslim World, October 1932, vol 22 p 348.

51 King Fuad of Egypt, in particular, was so perturbed over the rumors that the Caliphate question would be discussed and a Caliph proclaimed that the Grand Mufti had to visit Cairo in person and give both verbal and written assurances that the question would not be discussed. For Maulana Shaukat Ali, on the other hand, there was no Caliphate question since he continued to recognize Abdul Majeed as Caliph. (Arnold, T. Op. cit.. pp.241-4).

52 In the Islamic system the day begins at sunset and ends at the following sunset. Thus Rajab 27 (or Lailatul Miraj) did not begin until sunset on December 6.

53 Gibb, H.A.R., Op. cit.. p.105. The Jerusalem Congress was revived in 1953 and three conferences were held in 1953, 1956 and 1960. It has never again met since 1960. This was partly because the President of the Jerusalem Congress, *Hajj* Amin al-Husseini, became the President of a revived World Muslim Congress as well. He preferred to work with the latter organization since it enjoyed the political support of the Pakistan Government and the financial support of the Saudi Government.

54 Gibb, Op. cit., p l02.

55 Nielsen, Op. cit.. p. 353

56 Ibid..

57 Nielsen, Op. cit.. p 353

58 Full text of the report appended to the Palestine (Western or Wailing Wall), Order in Council 1931 as Schedules 1 and 2. See Statutory Rules and Orders for 1931. H M Stationery Office, London. 1932. pp. 462-6

59 This attitude was further concretely expressed during the period 1948-1967 when East Jerusalem was under Jordanian control. Jews were prohibited from praying at the Wailing Wall.

60 "The Arab lands are a complete and indivisible whole, and divisions of whatever nature to which they have been subjected are neither approved nor recognized by the Arab nation ..." Gibb, Op. cit. p.107 fn.

61 Cf. Marmorstein, Emile: "Religious Opposition to Nationalism in the Middle East." International Affairs, July 1952, pp. 344-357.

62 Among the orthodox Jews was the scholar, Prof Jacob de Haan. He was killed by the Zionists because of his stinging denunciation of Zionism. In an important interview in the early twenties he explained his viewpoint as follows:

"Do you think that history is but a series of accidents? I don't. . . . The Zionists suffer from the same spiritual blindness that caused our downfall. The two thousand years of Jewish exile and unhappiness have taught them nothing. Instead of making an attempt to understand the innermost causes of our unhappiness, they are trying to circumvent it, as it were, by building a `National Home' on foundations provided by Western power politics. And in the process of building that `National Home' they are committing the crime of depriving another people of their home." Asad, Muhammad, Road to Mecca. pp. 98-9.

63 "Oh you who believe, do not take the Jews and Christians as your protecting friends (i.e., do not turn to them for a security alliance, and not establish a relationship with them of dependence and subservience." Qur'an (5:51)

64 The Near East and India. December 24, 1931. p 687

65 Shaukat Ali was unhappy about the composition of the Committee and declined to serve on it. *Hajj* Amin had used his majority to exclude opponents among whom were capable men.

66 The Executive Committee successfully mediated a seven week war between Saudi Arabia and Yemen. A treaty was eventually signed ending the war.

67 Abdullah Yusuf Ali was a literary genius. His translation of the Qur'an was a magnificent literary accomplishment. But he was somewhat naive in his understanding of the political and economic guidance in the *Qur'an*. His supreme and unwavering loyalty to the British government led to a mind set which rendered him incapable of grasping the elementary fact that Allah sent the perfected religion of Islam to be supreme over both private and public life. He also failed to recognize bank interest as Riba. See M. A. Sharif's excellent biography of Abdullah Yusuf Ali entitled: `Searching for Solace'. Islamic Book Trust. Kuala Lumpur. 1994. [Islamic Book Trust, 3 Lorang 1A/71G, Jalan Carey, 46000 Petaling Jaya, Malaysia]

About the Author

Imran N. Hosein is a native of Trinidad, West Indies. He studied Islam under the guidance of the Islamic scholar and Sufi *Shaikh*, Maulana Dr. Muhammad Fadlur Rahman Ansari, at the Aleemiyah Institute of Islamic Studies, Karachi, and also spent one academic year at *Al-Azhar* University, Cairo. He did post-graduate studies in Philosophy at Karachi University and in International Relations at the University of the West Indies and the Graduate Institute of International Studies, Geneva.

A former Foreign Service Officer in the Trinidad and Tobago Foreign Service, he resigned his job in 1985 to devote his life to the cause of Islam, serving first Principal of the Aleemiyah Institute of Islamic Studies until 1988 when he began his Islamic lecture tours to South East Asia, North and South America and the Caribbean. Since 1991 he has served the cause of Islam in New York while attached to Masjid Darul *Qur'an* in Long Island.

As an author in Comparative Religion he has produced a seminal work on 'Islam and Buddhism', published in Pakistan in 1972. His works on Islam and International Relations include 'Diplomacy in Islam - An Analysis of the Treaty of Hudaibiyah', 'War and Peace in Islam', 'Islam and the New World Order', 'The Prophet of Islam in Jerusalem - The Strategic Significance of the Isra and Miraj', etc. A collection of his writings which include such topics as 'Dreams in Islam', ' From Makkah to Madina Once Again', 'Western Troops in Arabia - An Islamic View' etc., was also published in Singapore in 1991 under the title 'Islam and the Changing World Order'.

The present series of his writings in the Ansari Memorial Series consists of the following three titles: The Religion of Abraham and the State of Israel - A View from the *Qur'an*; The Caliphate The *Hejaz* and the Saudi-Wahhabi Nation-State; The Importance of the Prohibition of Riba in Islam